Univ. of
Toronto
Library

BINDING LIST OCT 1 1921.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/edinburghreviewo233londuoft

LE
E.

The Edinburgh Review or Critical Journal

JANUARY, 1921———APRIL, 1921.

To be continued Quarterly

Edited by HAROLD COX

167277
15/11/21

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR
Publius Syrus

VOL. 233.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.
London, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY, New York
1921

CONTENTS OF VOL. 233

No. 475 — JANUARY, 1921

		Page
Problems of the First World War		1
The Battle of Jutland	DAVID HANNAY	29
Psychotherapy and War Experience	WILLIAM A. BREND, M.D.	48
A Great German Chemist	Dr. M. O. FORSTER, F.R.S.	69
Capitalism. II.	Dr. A. SHADWELL	80
The Growth of London	A. WYATT TILBY	100
The Head of the Hill	WALTER SICHEL	116
The Function of Literary Criticism	ORLO WILLIAMS, M.C.	125
D'Annunzio's Lyric Poetry	L. COLLISON-MORLEY	136
Greece, Constantine, and Venizelos	JOHN MAVROGORDATO	146
Beginnings of Irish History	Capt. STEPHEN GWYNN	164
Irish Unrest Reviewed	PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.	178
Ireland the Enemy	EDITOR	196

No. 476 — APRIL, 1921

The Austrian Derelict		209
The Organization of the Empire	J. A. R. MARRIOTT, M.P.	218
The Nava Situation	Sir CYPRIAN BRIDGE, G.C.B.	238
The Future of Naval Construction	ARCHIBALD COLBECK	255
The Colour Problem	Sir F. T. LUGARD, G.C.M.G., P.C.	267
Labour in India	Col. H. A. YOUNG, C.I.E., C.B.E.	284
Extremes of Modern Painting, 1870-1920	FRANK RUTTER	298
The Changing Countryside	Hon. Mrs. EVELYN CECIL, C.B.E.	316
Asclepiades of Samos	F. A. WRIGHT	329
A Science of Society	CLARENCE H. NORTHCOTT	343
Adult Education	The Lord ERNLE, M.V.O.	357
Capitalism. III.	Dr. A. SHADWELL	371
The New Protection	EDITOR	387

The Edinburgh Review

JANUARY, 1921 No. 475

PROBLEMS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

1. The First World War 1914-1918: personal experiences of Lieut.-Colonel C. à Court Repington, C.M.G. Constable. 1920.
2. Sir Douglas Haig's Despatches. Edited by Lieut.-Colonel J. H. Boraston, O.B.E. J. M. Dent. 1920.
3. Old Europe's Suicide. By Brig.-General Christopher Birdwood Thomson. George Allen and Unwin.

IN the ninth century B.C., at the advanced age of ninety, the Chinese philosopher Lao Tse summed up in these three lines the wisdom necessary to the conduct of great affairs:—

'To govern a Kingdom, use righteousness.
'To conduct a war, use strategy.
'To be a true world-ruler, be occupied with inner life.'*

And again the sage expands his condensed precepts in this aphorism, with which no student of strategy will venture to disagree:—

'To govern men and to serve Heaven nothing is better than to 'have a reserve.
'The Master indeed has a reserve: it is called brilliant foresight.'†

When we examine the course taken by events in the First World War it will be as well to measure the decisions taken by the standards of old Lao Tse, the wise man of China; to ask ourselves whether throughout the prolonged struggle for mastery the successive cabinets which ruled this kingdom did in fact

* Chapter lvii., Tao Teh King. † Chapter lix. *ibid.*

All rights reserved.

govern it with ' righteousness ' ; whether in the conduct of the war the strategy they applied to the solution of its problems was sound in principle ; whether they proved themselves to possess that *masse de manœuvre* whose intervention in the affairs of men is decisive, that priceless reserve which Lao Tse calls ' brilliant foresight.'

After most great wars, even when the official historians have set forth their usually too official narratives of events, the student who wants to know why certain things happened has hitherto been faced with almost insuperable difficulty in ascertaining the data on which important decisions were based, until such a lapse of time has occurred that the generation responsible for the conduct of affairs feels assured that revelations can no longer hurt it. If ' Never raise a question which can be postponed ' is an honoured maxim of every Government department in every highly organized State with its roots deep in the past, a maxim equally revered is ' Never dig about among dead bones ' except, indeed, to search for precedents. The new republics of Germany and Russia have shown a refreshing recklessness in the matter of revelations ; but as yet neither is a highly organized State ; while their roots, if any, are not deep in the past of Imperial Germany and Imperial Russia. They are the *parvenus* of the society of nations and it was only to be expected that they should break away from tradition and publish their secrets widely and wildly.

In those countries which have not yet indulged in the experiment of making a clean break with their past and which still accept the venerable precepts of traditional State-craft, startling revelations were not to be expected within the lifetime of this generation. A certain number of individuals in every civilized country know how things are done ; they are inside the governing circle : to use a common expression ' they know the ropes.' These people know, from day to day, why things have happened. They are of the priestly caste, whether by birth or by adoption, and as such they know the mechanism by which the fire from Heaven is brought to the altar to consume the burnt offering in the sight of the awe-struck multitude. Widely as they differ in opinion and in capacity, they have, as a rule, this bond in common : they understand and respect the importance of discretion. Whether by inherited instinct, or by training

consequent upon personal experience of public affairs, they have been brought to appreciate the fact that, even to secure success in some bitter political controversy, it is not desirable to disclose confidences, whether made by friends or by opponents ; public life, they realise, would become impossible without that common ground of mutual respect for confidences shared in common.

This respect for discretion, which is the necessary lubricant of the machinery of politics and diplomacy, is the despair of the curious student of affairs. To such a student the publication of Colonel Repington's book comes as a perfect godsend. Aware that Colonel Repington was on terms of intimacy with some of our most distinguished soldiers ; that he numbered among his acquaintances many men eminent in our public life ; that as the military correspondent of the *Times* throughout the major portion of the war he had acquired a European reputation as the first of military critics, our curious student could but feel that if only Colonel Repington would be indiscreet what a lot might be learnt about the war—why certain things were done and certain other things were left undone. Perhaps, indeed, he would be able to explain the twin mysteries of the war :— Why the Germans failed to win, and why the Allies did not beat them sooner ? To an irresponsible student the first sentence of Colonel Repington's preface must surely bring comfort, for in it the author tells us that these records of his personal experiences during the war

' are a contribution towards the elucidation of the truth so far as I was able to ascertain it at the time, and will, I hope, enable many to understand better the events of these memorable years.'

If the student is sufficiently irresponsible—so irresponsible as to prefer the satisfaction of his curiosity to the interests of his country—he will derive much comfort from the next sentence :

' A certain amount has been omitted on the recommendation of eminent counsel and some names have also been left out ; but for the rest the entries in my diary have been left substantially as they were written, and are a faithful record of my impressions during this extraordinary and eventful epoch.'

That reference to ' eminent counsel ' will be found most comforting, for though it implies the lack of a hypersensitive conscience it does indicate a proper fear of the law of libel. And

by the time he has turned the last page of the second volume the curious student, sated with revelations, can but marvel at a courage in indiscretion which amounts to recklessness in its disregard of the probable consequences of publishing broadcast confidences respecting the motives and actions of men still charged with important functions in our national life and that of our Allies. Colonel Repington spares few reputations, but in the end it will be found, perhaps, that what has suffered most is his own reputation as a man in whose discretion confidence can be placed. We are ready to accept as a fact that during the war many secrets were told to Colonel Repington ; his book makes us surmise that he will probably hear no more.

Many of Colonel Repington's pages are bright with the chatter of certain dinner and luncheon parties in London ; while others are enlivened by reminiscences of pleasant week-end parties where the author enjoyed good bridge and good talk. It would be wrong however to infer from this that the women of England took the war as gaily as so many of Colonel Repington's hostesses appear to have done. If he has given us a faithful picture of what he saw and heard in the houses he frequented, he has naturally not been able to tell us what was happening in that far larger section of society which he did not care to frequent. When it is realised that in those houses where Colonel Repington enjoyed such good bridge and such agreeable talk the hostess as a rule was an American, and that America did not come into the war till 1917, it will be seen how untrue a picture this book gives of London society during the war. In any case we are at a loss to understand why Colonel Repington in an important book on a subject of such moment as ' The First World War ' should have thought fit to extend to his readers the private invitations he himself received, and to admit them to the unguarded intimacies of a social intercourse which has no bearing on the main purpose of the book. We can only record our regret that Colonel Repington, the irresponsible chronicler of the doings of a section of society, should so gravely mar the work of Colonel Repington the serious student of war. Our business here is with the mind of Colonel Repington the soldier, a keen instrument, tempered by thought, study and experience.

It is impossible to consider the broad lines of the strategy of the war without defining our mental attitude on the great

problem raised by the controversy between 'Easterners' and 'Westerners.' In that controversy Colonel Repington claims to be an uncompromising 'Westerner' and tells us that on several occasions he was used by distinguished soldiers to put before the public the views they held as to the correct use in war of the resources at the disposal of the Allies, and thus bring pressure upon the Governments of this country and of France. The Westerner held that a decision could and should be forced on the Western front. When the war of movement on the Western front became in the winter of 1914-15 a war of entrenched positions the Easterners urged that operations against Turkey promised more immediate results than the slow process of attrition which conditions prevailing in the Western theatre seemed to impose on the Allies. While the Russian army was in being as a fighting force it is clear that the opening of the Dardanelles would have facilitated the supply of arms and munitions to the Russians and thus have greatly intensified the pressure they could bring to bear on the armies of the Central Powers; that increased pressure would have re-acted powerfully on the situation in France and Flanders. It may further be admitted as beyond dispute that a decisive success against Turkey in 1915 would have kept Bulgaria from joining the Central Powers and very probably have brought her and Roumania in on the side of the Allies, thus completing the circle of the Allied blockade. On these points there is small dispute.

The point at issue is whether in 1915 forces could be spared for so great an operation as a successful war against Turkey without gravely imperilling the situation on the Western front—where defeat meant disaster for the Allies. Colonel Repington's opinion on the point is clear. In page after page of his diary we find him lamenting the diversion from the war on the Western front of men, munitions and shipping for the furtherance of what he calls our Eastern ventures. He is a convinced and, with two exceptions, which will be noted later, a consistent 'Westerner.' Equally at the beginning, in the middle, and towards the end of the war, his formula for winning remained the same: victory and the fruits thereof were to be sought by the defeat of the main German army which was to be found on the Western front, in close proximity to the national bases of the Allies; while, *per contra*, disaster there entailed the ruin of

the Allies and a German triumph which would not be diminished in any appreciable degree by successes won in any Eastern theatre. From this proposition no soldier will dissent.

Even the most complete Easterner recognised the paramount importance of avoiding disaster on the Western front. The case of the Easterner is forcibly put in a book with the unfortunate title of 'Old Europe's Suicide' by Brigadier-General C. B. Thomson, whose experience as British Military Attaché with the Serbian army in the Balkan War and with the Roumanian army in 1916 and 1917, and afterwards as one of the British military representatives on the Supreme War Council at Versailles in 1918, entitle him to be heard, although they give grounds to assume in him an Eastern bias no less accentuated than Colonel Repington's bias for the Western front. General Thomson tells us :—

'The Eastern situation demanded in the first place statesmanship. A military policy was needed which, while recognizing the preponderating importance of securing the Western front, would aim at bringing pressure to bear on every part of the enemy combination, which would not be content with local successes, but would attack Pan-Germanism, the real menace to the British Empire, where its activities were centred, which would strike at Germany through her near Eastern allies, complete the circle of blockade on land and retrieve the sources of supply which had been taken from Roumania.'

It will be seen from these quotations that this convinced Easterner is as insistent as is Colonel Repington on the paramount importance of security on the Western front before the Allies embarked on any ventures in the East. Now security on any given front in a war which lasts several years is a relative thing. In 1914 the main enemy effort was made on the west, and there it failed. The next great effort was made against Russia when conditions in the west had stabilized ; the Western front remained as always a vital danger-spot for the Allies and the only theatre of war in which the *coup de grâce* could be given, but support of Russia became at once an interest for the Allies only second in importance to the maintenance of the Western front. Short of beating the German army on the Western front, which the battle of Neuve Chapelle had shown to be visionary at that time, the best thing we could do was to knock out Turkey quickly, bring Bulgaria and Roumania in on our side while the Serbian army

was in being, and munition Russia through the Dardanelles in return for supplies of food from southern Russia. Hence the decision to operate against Turkey by forcing the Dardanelles. The fruits of a possible victory there can now be measured and appraised. The help given to the Russian army would at once have reacted in our favour on the Western front and brought tactical victory in France within the compass of 1916: our blockade of Germany would have begun to be effective in 1915, thus ante-dating by two years the incidence of that factor which was the predominant cause of the national collapse of our enemies in 1918. Incidentally the consequent shortening of the war would have saved Europe from Russian Bolshevism.

Perhaps more than justice has been visited upon the head of the Minister whom the public judged to be responsible for the Dardanelles fiasco, but less than justice has been done to him for the brilliant insight into the situation at the moment which led him to urge and convince his reluctant colleagues of the advisability in 1915 of opening the Dardanelles and knocking Turkey out of the war. 'Brilliant insight'—which Mr. Churchill has shown himself to possess in so large a measure—is not the same thing as the 'brilliant foresight' which old Lao Tse advocates. 'Brilliant foresight' in the matter of a major operation of war against Turkey was, from the very nature of the case, the duty of the Committee of Imperial Defence as constituted before the war. After all Turkey was a considerable military power—though far from being of the first rank,—and her capital, and the approaches to it, were not to be occupied by the first comer who chose to knock at the door. A stroke at the heart of the Turkish Empire required a well-considered plan of operation and the provision of adequate means. In 1915 neither desideratum was available, so one improvisation followed on another: first a naval operation, then a military operation, until in due course the proper end to improvisation in war came in a well thought-out and admirably executed evacuation of the Gallipoli Peninsula.

The Eastern failure in 1915 was due, not to the fact that the operations were Eastern, but to the fact that they had not been thought out in advance and therefore that adequate means had not been provided to carry them through. It was not Easternism but ill-conducted Easternism which withdrew from the Western front in 1915 an increasing mass of men, munitions and material,

which that front was ill able to afford and could only afford at all because the German army at the same time committed itself to an Eastern adventure—its great attack on Russia. Discussing the German offensive of 1918 with Colonel Repington while it was still in progress, Field Marshal Sir William Robertson said that he had had the probability of such an offensive in his mind ever since 1914, ' only fortunately the Boche had trotted off to ' Russia and left us the initiative, from which we might have ' profited had the cabinet done their duty about man-power.' Could we have used better the initiative thus given to us in 1915 than by taking Constantinople and opening the road to Russia ? That is doubtful ; what is certain is that we could not have used our opportunity worse than in achieving a failure at the cost of so many men, ships and munitions wasted upon an improvisation at the Dardanelles. Improvisation in modern war is a desperately expensive business : backing numbers at roulette is a staid and sober pursuit compared to improvising the major operations of war !

If the decision taken by Mr. Asquith's government to undertake a great operation against Turkey may be justified by the assumption that in 1915 help thus given to the Russian army would directly help the Allies on the Western front by strengthening the Russian operations and so draw more Germans to Poland and Galicia, the situation altered fundamentally when Russia, wrecked by anarchy, fell out of the fighting line. The Easterners were now driven to support the policy they still favoured by arguments which perforce disregarded any direct influence on the situation in France and Flanders and which based the achievement of ultimate success on the isolation of Germany through the successive defeats and detachment of her Allies, beginning with Turkey. In a notorious speech Mr. Lloyd George spoke of ' the deadlock ' on the Western front and did what in him lay to shake the confidence of the Allied armies in their commanders on the Western front by insinuating that the heavy casualties incurred there were disproportionate to the gain in ground. It was, as Colonel Repington shows in page after page of his diary, against the advice of our general staff, represented by the solid sanity of Sir William Robertson, that more and more men, munitions and shipping were absorbed in re-enforcing and maintaining offensives in Mesopotamia and Palestine, while a

great army was committed to an indefinite operation at Salonika, where strategy was subordinated to a policy which seems to have had no stability even in the minds of those who advocated it. Brigadier-General Thomson is one of the few soldiers who have written in support of that outlook on the problems of the Great War which is described as Easternism. The non-professional preachers of Easternism in the cabinet—and out of it—go rather farther than he does in his presentation of the case for the policy he advocates in the following words :—

'If the broad lines of an Eastern policy had been laid down and insisted on by the Allied Governments, a plan could have been put into execution which, while offensive operations were in progress in Mesopotamia, Palestine and Macedonia, would have directed against the heart of the Ottoman Empire a strategic reserve concentrated with that objective in view at one or more of the Eastern Mediterranean ports. The force required would not have been considerable. The Turkish and Bulgarian armies were held on three distant fronts, leaving weak and scattered garrisons in Constantinople, Thrace and the defences of the Dardanelles. The difficulties were many but the stakes were big. The fall of Constantinople would have revolutionised the Near Eastern situation . . . .'

'At the beginning of 1917 it did not involve the detachment of many additional divisions from other theatres. The aggregate casualties in one of the big offensives would have more than met requirements. This detachment could have been justified on strategical grounds, since it would have forced the enemy to conform to at least an equal extent.'

In our judgment the plea for Easternism in the paragraph just quoted contains a fundamental fallacy, viz. : that after the Russian revolution any Eastern operation, however successful, 'would have forced the enemy to conform to at least an equal 'extent.' The enemy offensive of March 1918 delivered on the Western or decisive front with the full force of the German armies set free for such an operation by the collapse of Russia, was conceived and carried out by a general staff unperturbed by any events which had happened or could happen in the Near East. In Mesopotamia the Turkish fifth army had been beaten into a jelly by Sir Stanley Maude and his successor Sir William Marshall. In Palestine Sir Edmund Allenby had out-fought and out-generalled his German opponent and the group of Turkish armies he commanded ; Baghdad and Jerusalem were both in British hands ; Turkey was in process of dissolution : but, disregarding

these incidents as so many details which should not be allowed to obscure their judgment, the able soldiers who directed German strategy applied the right remedy at the right place—a decisive attack on the Western front made with every man and gun and aeroplane they could lay hands on !

It is not possible to improve on the phrase in which Colonel Repington in his diary crystallizes his appreciation of the situation : ' What would it profit us if we gain the whole Eastern world ' and suffer the loss of our own soul, France ? ' How nearly we suffered that loss is described in restrained and measured words by the Commander-in-Chief of the British armies in France in his despatch dated the 20th July 1918, included in the collection of ' Sir Douglas Haig's Despatches ' edited by Lt.-Colonel Boraston. Sir Douglas tells us that these despatches are re-published ' as a tribute to the valour of the British soldier ' and the character of the British nation ' ; they are a worthy tribute which will endure long after the dust of controversies has been laid. Of his own personal share in the victory which eventually crowned our arms, Sir Douglas Haig tells us nothing. Marshal Foch, however, helps us to bridge the gap in his most interesting and suggestive introduction which is a tribute to the wisdom, judgment and loftiness of character of the British Field-Marshal.

We learn from Sir Douglas Haig :—

> ' The disappearance of Russia as a belligerent country on the side of the Entente Powers had set free the great bulk of the German and Austrian divisions on the Eastern front. Already at the beginning of November 1917 the transfer of German divisions from the Russian to the Western front had begun. It became certain that the movement would be continued steadily until numerical superiority lay with the enemy.'

A footnote draws attention to the fact that prior to November 1917 many thousands of fresh troops had been brought from the Eastern front as drafts. Surely there was one lesson—and one lesson only—to be read from the writing on the wall : every man, unit or formation available, consistent with the bare minimum required for security elsewhere should have been hurried to France to strengthen the reserves at the disposal of Sir Douglas Haig. A government so destitute of foresight as to continue an offensive strategy in the East after the Russian *débâcle* might

at any rate, even at the eleventh hour, have realized its errors when the intelligence division of the general staff told it coldly and impartially the story of the troop movements in progress in Germany, and pointed to the mounting tale of German divisions accumulating for an operation which could be nothing less than the most powerful attack any army had had to endure since armies were first used to settle the disputes of nations.

This exercise in common-sense postulated however at the head of the Government a personality quite other than that of the Prime Minister. Colonel Repington records for our benefit a saying of Lord Haldane's (vol. ii. p. 139) at this particular time, which is the key to much of what happened, that Mr. Lloyd George's mind 'fastened on images and banned concepts.' The Eastern image still proved more alluring than the hard facts about the position on the Western front. One of those hard facts was that on June 6th 1918 the British armies in France were short of 114,000 infantry, or about one-seventh of their rifle strength (p. 173). Yet, if Colonel Repington's recollection of a conversation with M. Clemenceau on February 3 is to be trusted, the British Prime Minister's mind was still filled at that late date with the alluring image of winning the war by beating the Turks. This conversation and the use subsequently made of it by Colonel Repington is so important that it is well to quote Colonel Repington's record of it.

'Clemenceau greeted me most cordially, and told me the whole history of the War Council. It had begun with a meeting of the four Premiers and the soldiers, when L. G. had recommended in a long, eloquent and clever speech the Aleppo expedition and the idea of finishing the war by 'knocking out the Turk!' He had told Clemenceau that he and the Westerners had no plan. Clemenceau had replied in a speech which he thought had completely demolished L. G.'s case. He had said that if the Turks wished to surrender they could do so now, but that if they thought the Germans had the best of things they would not surrender, and a march on Aleppo would not make them. . . . Next day they came to drafting an article to meet the case, when it was agreed that the expedition should only take place if the situation elsewhere rendered it safe, and Clemenceau caused to be inserted the proviso that no troops for it should be taken from the French and British armies in the West or from those at Salonika. C. thought that the expedition was defeated by these provisions, but I said that I did not feel sure. Robertson made a brilliant and emphatic speech opposing the expedition, and Clemenceau

stated openly that he agreed with R., but the article was agreed to as C. thought it harmless. . . . The second main point was the question of effectives. Hutchison produced our figures, which showed our weakness and failure to provide the men. . . . L. G. then went on to threaten a social revolution if the country were asked for more men, and made the most of the argument. Foch then rose to continue the discussion, when L. G. waved him down and refused to listen to any more discussion on the subject, which was one way of treating the Allied Council. The whole object of L. G., Clemenceau thought, was to exclude from the discussion the consideration of subjects which L. G., for his own purposes, claimed as the business of his Government alone, and Clemenceau said that as L. G. took these grounds the French could not insist nor carry the argument beyond a certain point. He said that L. G. was obviously very angry, and that it would never have done for the Council to have broken up over a question of this kind.

'The last question was that of the reserves. It had been finally decided—and that was news to me, and very bad news—that the Versailles soldiers, one from each of the four nations (with Weygand excluded at Italian suggestion, and Foch acting as President), were to have control of the reserves, were to have the right of going about among the armies and of looking into things and, generally, of directing the reserves as they wished. Thus both Haig and Robertson are practically relieved of responsibility, which is vested in a board by political decision. It is disunity of command and three Richmonds in the field.'

On March 21, 1918 the great German attack was launched. For the narrative of that attack we must refer the reader to the pages of 'Sir Douglas Haig's Despatches,' where he will find, told in balanced and dispassionate words, the story of the first phase of the greatest battle in which the British army has ever been engaged. On the first day of the battle at least sixty-four German divisions took part—'a number considerably exceeding 'the total forces composing the entire British army in France,' as we are told by no less a person than the Commander-in-Chief of that army. When we recollect the offensives then mounted in Mesopotamia, Palestine and Macedonia, with a view to winning the war in the East, we are enabled to take the measure of Mr. Lloyd George's strategy.

'To govern men and to serve Heaven,' said Lao Tse, 'nothing 'is better than to have a reserve.' Where was the reserve which would have enabled the British army to serve the cause of the Allies by defeating the great German attack? They were in the East where they were not wanted instead of being in the West

where they were wanted. That ' brilliant foresight ' which Lao Tse tells us is the reserve appropriate to ' the master ' was conspicuously absent from the armoury of the master of the fate of Great Britain. The indomitable courage of the troops, and the fact—recorded by Marshal Foch in his introduction to ' Sir Douglas Haig's Despatches '—that ' at every stage both ' higher command and staffs proved more than equal to their ' tasks,' saved the British army from the disaster to which it had been so unnecessarily exposed.

In criticising the decisions taken by the War Cabinet it is necessary to remember that there were British interests in the East so vital that important operations had to be undertaken to safeguard them. It was necessary that the Turkish armies threatening those interests should be met and defeated. By the summer of 1917 in Mesopotamia General Maude had broken the Turkish fifth army in the battles round Kut, and had severely punished its remaining fragments north and north-east of Baghdad. That army could no longer undertake any offensive operation unless heavily reinforced, and such reinforcements could not take place unless its line of communications was recast by an extension of the Baghdad railway from Nisibin to Mosul, with the provision of transport on a large scale which would take many months to effect. So far as danger to Egypt was concerned, we find General Allenby writing to Colonel Repington on September 25th : ' Falkenhayn, I think, has his eyes on Baghdad. ' If he comes my way he will have great difficulty in supplying ' his army ; and with his present strength has not a chance ' against me.' Clearly neither in Mesopotamia nor in Palestine did the defence of British interests demand offensive campaigns. Yet in both these theatres of war offensive operations were undertaken on a considerable scale. By the end of October 1918 they resulted in the destruction of the Turkish armies and the occupation of Mosul and Damascus ; while in Macedonia the Bulgarian army had crumbled under the attack of General Franchet d'Esperet. These most successful operations can only be justified if their success can be shewn to have hastened the end of the war—they were not required for security.

The difference between victory and defeat is considerable ; the first gives one power to limit commitments as well as to exploit success ; the second transfers that power to the victorious

enemy. To suggest that our victories in the East committed us to exploiting those victories by further Eastern advances is the negation of common sense, and therefore false strategy. Sound strategy and common sense are more closely wedded than strategy and policy, and are not lightly to be put asunder.

The situation in 1917, after the collapse of Russia, demanded that we should turn our successes in the East to account by strictly limiting our Eastern commitments in order to increase our fighting resources in the West where the war was to be won, if the intention was to win it by fighting. If the intention of the Allies was to win the war by negotiation and not by fighting, that is to say, if they thought that they could attain their war aims by exchanging captured Eastern pawns for Western pawns in the power of Germany, plausible arguments can be advanced for exploiting our Eastern victories by further offensives, but only provided that the impending German attack in the West could be safely discounted owing to our preparations for security there being adequate to meet it. This however was not the case. In March 1918 we very nearly lost the war because the courage of our troops and the skill of our commanders had to make good great deficiencies in men and material which were not available in the West because they had been committed to preparations for exploiting our Eastern successes.

In the main, with certain reservations, we agree with Colonel Repington's estimate of the quality of the strategy of the Allies as applied to the general conduct of the war, in balancing the claims of the Eastern and Western fronts. Our faith in Colonel Repington's judgment in matters of strategy is somewhat shaken however, when we find this convinced and otherwise uncompromising Westerner at one moment advocating a landing at Alexandretta, and at another urging that his friend Sir Archibald Murray should be reinforced in Egypt. An outlook on the problems of strategy which can be swayed by the human desire to see personal friends win battles is a doubtful asset in a writer who poses as the dispassionate critic of the errors of statesmen.

This instability in judgment is certainly human, but does not accord with the attitude of omniscience in strategical questions which is the most marked characteristic of the entries in Colonel Repington's diary as published in ' The First World War.' It is natural, though not very wise, to record in a diary admiration

for the soundness of judgment of those who agree with one, and only for those who do so, irrespective of their achievements. The general impression left on the reader is that Colonel Repington's friends—Lord French and Sir Archibald Murray—were, in the writer's opinion, soldiers of greater capacity than Sir Douglas Haig, with whom his relations were not quite so cordial.

If, as is possible, one of the purposes intended by the publication of Colonel Repington's diary is to show the consistent prescience of its writer in his various appreciations of successive phases of the war, it is natural that reference to his opinions should be omitted when they failed to accord with the development of the situation. We find recorded in the diary small reliance on the Russian army. Its lack of organization, and, as a rule, its indifferent leadership, are duly discounted. A student of Colonel Repington's work whose knowledge of it was confined to 'The First World War' would be surprised to find that the military correspondent of the *Times* had recorded on the 29th August 1914 that 'Russia for her part is performing 'the function of a steam roller . . .' and that 'Russia should 'reach Berlin within two months'; and again, in the same article which is entitled 'Stone-walling and Steam-rolling,' we find this :—

> 'There is a very great difference between the tasks of the Allies in the Western and in the Eastern theatre of war. Our task is stone-walling, and that of the Russians is steam-rolling. Our numbers and situation in the West are such that only some extraordinary stroke of good fortune could give us a smashing victory and enable us to annihilate. It is therefore our business to keep our wicket up while Russia makes the runs.'

That is more than a flirtation with Easternism—it is Easternism pure and undefiled.

In his accounts of his two visits to the Italian theatre of operations, where he was received with a courtesy and consideration to which he has done full justice in his diary, Colonel Repington writes with proper appreciation for the special difficulties of the Italian army, and poses as one anxious to lead his countrymen to a better understanding of the nature of the anxious problem confronting our Allies; he writes, in short, as the self-appointed missionary of an Anglo-Italian entente whose

task it is to clear away the fogs of misunderstanding. In his diary for November 2, 1917 Colonel Repington records that he had been writing on the Italian campaign. What he wrote he does not say, but it appears to have been this, which appeared on November 4, 1917 :—

'It is not only the Italian front that has crumbled. It is the military repute of Italy that has not survived the rough touch of German arms. The shameful retreats and wholesale surrenders are a new fact in the general situation, and if this continues we shall have to consider the Italian army as in a state of decomposition. . . . . Most of all we deplore the loss of spirit, which is to an army what honour is to a woman.'

As if this slap in the face to our Ally were not enough, we find our self-appointed missionary of an Anglo-Italian understanding following it up on February 3, 1918 by writing in the *National News* of that date, at a time when his country was at war with Austria and in alliance with Italy :—

'The English do not want to fight Austria, which is an ancient ally of ours, and we have regretted that our troops have had to go to Italy to fight with her.'

These extracts from his newspaper work give us a measure of the stability of judgment of the author of 'The First World 'War.' We have described the mind of Colonel Repington, the soldier, as a keen instrument, tempered by thought, study and experience. But the keener the instrument, the finer the temper of the blade, the more urgent is the need for its use to be governed in accordance with the dictates of a balanced and restrained judgment. It is not a weapon safely to be entrusted to any politico-military bravo, responding to personal impulses whether of friendship and agreement, or dislike and disagreement. Those who agreed with Colonel Repington, and were in the habit of communicating freely to him secrets which were only theirs by virtue of their position in the Government or because certain members of the cabinet trusted their discretion, find in him a stalwart defender. Those who did not open their hearts as well as their minds to Colonel Repington—such men as Sir Douglas Haig, for example—are fortunate if their subsequent achievements have put them so far out of reach of attack that the references to them in this apparently well-revised diary are merely cold,

and so worded as to convey to the reader a somewhat disparaging impression of the individual who failed to appreciate the importance of consulting Colonel Repington. But that, after all, is a human foible, which only damages the man who publishes his diary; it is too easy to recognise and to discount to do much harm. A far graver charge of misuse of that keen instrument—his intellect—lies against Colonel Repington: it is that of allowing himself to be used in an attempt to upset the government of his country at a critical moment in the war by divulging the secret proceedings of the conference at Versailles in February 1918.

On February 11, 1918 the *Morning Post* published an article by Colonel Repington with the headings: 'The War Council; Paris discussions; remarkable reports.' In that article Colonel Repington drew the attention of Parliament, and incidentally brought conspicuously to the notice of our enemy, then preparing an offensive on the Western front, the following facts:—

(1). That the British Prime Minister was contemplating the delivery to Turkey of a knock-out blow which would be governed by the rate of advance of our broad-gauge railway in Palestine.

(2). That this could be countered by the Germans seizing the Russian Black Sea fleet and bringing submarines to Constantinople.

(3). That our man-power situation was deplorable and that the British Government was not dealing adequately with it.

(4). That one of the chief results of the Council, and one of the most dangerous, taken against all sound principles, was that the reserves of the British and French armies were no longer to be controlled by the commander in the field but were to be controlled by an external authority, viz.: 'the Versailles soldiers, under the presidency of General Foch.'

Colonel Repington concluded his article with the following words:—

'My opinion is that by starving our armies in the field, by advocating adventures contrary to the advice of his legitimate military advisers, and by approving a decision which deprives our commander in France of his full command, Mr. Lloyd George has clearly and finally proved his incapacity to govern England in a great war. This is the situation which Parliament must clear up in such a manner as it thinks best.'

Obviously if Parliament agreed with Colonel Repington the proper thing for it to do was to get rid of Mr. Lloyd George.

The publication of Colonel Repington's article in the *Morning Post* did not achieve the desired end. It led to his conviction at Bow Street, when the magistrate who sentenced him—Sir John Dickinson—addressed to him the following grave warning :—

> ' Colonel Repington, I regret that a distinguished soldier forgot, momentarily I hope, to be a good citizen. The lapse was a serious one, and you must pay a penalty of £100 and forty guineas costs.'

If the indiscretion had only concerned Colonel Repington as an individual the matter might well be left where the magistrate left it. Unfortunately scandal got busy and the honour of the general staff was impugned by unfounded allegations, recently repeated, that the secrets of the Versailles Council had been given away to Colonel Repington by a staff officer who had access to the papers of the British Military Mission. If it does nothing else, we hope that the publication of ' The First World War ' will expose that particular falsehood.

We have quoted freely from Colonel Repington's record of his important conversation with M. Clemenceau on February 3, 1918. It is perfectly clear from this entry in the diary that the secrets of the Versailles Council were given away to Colonel Repington by M. Clemenceau and by nobody else. In short, the then Prime Minister of France used Colonel Repington in an attempt to make his own policy prevail over that of his British colleague ; Colonel Repington lent himself for the purpose and fulfilled his task with a zest which readers of ' The First World War ' are in a position to appreciate. Colonel Repington did not act precipitately. To judge by the amount of sympathy his action received, as recorded in his diary, many of his countrymen, including some men of eminence, approved his action ; and yet, in view of the possible military dangers of the disclosure of important military decisions we cannot but agree with the words we have quoted from Sir John Dickinson's judgment, that in making public those particular secrets Colonel Repington ' forgot ' to be a good citizen.' That however is very far from saying that the decisions taken at Versailles or the policy advocated there by Mr. Lloyd George are to be approved. On the subject of Eastern operations in 1917 and 1918 and their unfortunate reaction on the Western front in 1918 we have made our position clear. We can now turn to two other questions raised in the

Morning Post article which led to Colonel Repington's appearance at Bow Street: the question of man-power and that of unity of command on the Western front.

The man-power question—by which we mean the problem of applying correctly to the various situations arising during the course of the war, the total available manhood of the nation, taking duly into account the respective demands for men by the navy, the army, and air force, the munition works, civil industry and shipping—was by far the most difficult administrative question our successive governments had to face between the outbreak of war and the armistice. In Colonel Repington's pages it looms large,but it does not occupy a prominence disproportionate to its intrinsic importance, for it was the lynch-pin of the war in the case of every belligerent nation except Russia. If man-power failed, or was wrongly applied, which is the same thing in other words, catastrophe would ensue as surely as night follows day. Colonel Repington's recipe had the merit of simplicity. It may be stated thus without doing the writer any injustice: the army in war holds the fate of the nation on the points of its bayonets; everything, therefore, must be sacrificed to giving the army the numbers and the munitions it requires to beat the enemy; if our scheme of operations requires so many men, those men must be found regardless of consequences to industries other than the munition industries; 'combing out' must be systematic and quite relentless in its disregard of considerations other than the needs of the army for victory.

Colonel Repington states his case better than this; he has more space at his disposal and can elaborate his thesis; but, in condensed form, that is his line of argument. At frequent intervals during the war he judged the Government in power at the time by this standard: Were they doing the best they could for the army? It is the test, or perhaps we should be more correct in saying the more important test, of the many he applied to Lord Kitchener as a War Minister, to the Liberal Government under Mr. Asquith, to the first Coalition Government under the same statesman and, finally, to the second Coalition Government under Mr. Lloyd George. In every case the minister or Government concerned failed in its duty, as judged by Colonel Repington's standard His logical conclusion, his own premises being *ex-hypothes* beyond dispute, is that no British Government did its duty in

the man-power question. Judged by his standards, and they are high ones, only one Government did do its duty by its army as regards men—the German Government; and Germany, it happens, lost the war.

If British Governments had followed Colonel Repington's advice, probably we should have lost the war before the Germans did so. Colonel Repington, the brilliant writer on war, has missed one factor in modern war which dominates every other; it is this: that in modern war, the war of nations, it is the nation that loses the war and not the army. The defeat of the nation brings about the defeat of the army. While a great nation is sound its army can and will go on fighting, but when the nation goes the army goes. With this proposition those who had to deal with the German rear-guards so late as October 1918 will probably agree; it would be idle to expect Colonel Repington to agree or to give his mind to so small a problem of minor tactics when he is criticising the conduct of the war by soldiers and statesmen. Yet this is the lesson of the Russian collapse, the Austrian collapse, and finally of the German collapse.

In the case of small nations, exposed to the overwhelming blows of great powers, such as Roumania under the Austro-German attack, the inverse is the case: the army crumbles and the nation follows. But where great powers are concerned, and are engaged in a death grapple with powers which are not much more than their equals, the army remains to the last the soundest element in the nation, and it only fails when the nation behind it has failed. The true targets of modern war, the spiritual as well as the material targets, are first the enemy nation, and after that the enemy army. It is the first penalty soldiers have paid for calling into being that monstrous enemy of civilization 'the 'nation in arms.' Many who have written glibly of 'the nation 'in arms' have overlooked the fact that in that very phrase the word 'nation' precedes the word 'arms.' Colonel Repington is one of them. It is that oversight which discounts much of his attack on every British Government for failing to do its duty as regards man-power.

After all, on the question of man-power, in its more technical aspect, Colonel Repington is an amateur. He is an expert in strategy, but when it comes to estimating on census returns what proportion of the population these islands can surrender to the

army and to munition work without national disaster, we are not justified in accepting his dictum that every British Government which was in power from the outbreak of war until we achieved victory was criminally negligent of the interests of the country.

It is well to turn from the *obiter dicta* of Colonel Repington the military correspondent to the reasoned opinion of a soldier with practical experience of the problem of man-power. An important lecture on 'man-power' was given at the United Service Institution on December 1, 1920 by Major-General B. Burnett-Hitchcock, the Director General of Mobilization and Recruiting at the War Office. When introducing the lecturer to his audience, the chief of the Imperial General Staff (Field-Marshal Sir Henry Wilson) drew attention to the fact that on the question of man-power the lecturer spoke with authority and a knowledge of this intricate subject possessed by few. He reminded his hearers that General Burnett-Hitchcock had accomplished the difficult and immense task of demobilizing successfully some five millions of men from the British army during the period since the Armistice. On the question of the proportion of man-power which is available for war in a nation we do not find this authority on the subject in agreement with Colonel Repington. General Burnett-Hitchcock puts a definite limit on that proportion of the national resources in men which can be made available for the needs of navy, army and air force. He says :—

'An examination of such figures as are available of the last war, both from the British army in its component parts and from other countries ; and of such figures as are available of former wars (though I must admit that for purposes of man-power they are not above suspicion) have led me to the conclusion that the maximum effort which can be expected from the average country as regards the numbers of men which it puts into the field, and—this is important—is prepared to maintain there for any continuous period, is 10 per cent. of its total population.'

During the war some 4,800,000 men passed through the ranks of the British army, nearly all coming from the island of Great Britain, which has a population of 42,000,000, of which 20,300,000 are males. If we add to these figures the numbers raised for the navy and its essential ancillary services, dock yards, mine sweepers, etc., for which we have not the figures, it would appear that successive British Governments were not so negligent of

their duties in regard to man-power as Colonel Repington would have us believe. Critics of government policy in relation to man-power are apt to overlook the fact that concurrently with the shortage of men for the British armies in France in 1917, the submarine menace had become acute and could only be met by hurried and extensive building of craft designed to counter the activities of the ' U ' boats. This intensive development in naval construction absorbed vast numbers of men, and from the nature of the work a very large proportion had to be able-bodied men such as the army needed, but the safety of this country and ultimate winning of the war depended on these requirements of the navy being supplied, even at the price of suspending operations in the field which put too great a strain on the draft-producing resources of the country. In this connection it may again be repeated that the needs of the army in France could and should have been met by limiting our Eastern drafts to the essential minimum required for security against the Turks, while the balance was placed at Sir Douglas Haig's disposal for dealing with the German army in the decisive theatre of operations in the West.

In discussing Mr. Lloyd George's attitude about man-power at the Versailles Council in February 1918 Colonel Repington pours scorn on the Prime Minister's alleged fears of revolution in this country if demands for further great sacrifices were made on the working men. It is difficult for anyone who, unlike the War Cabinet, has not at his disposal a mass of reports culled from every section of the population in every district of the country, to estimate to what extent the fears of the Government were justified. We know from General Lüdendorf that in Germany similar reports were made to the Government and were disregarded at the instance of the great general staff which reiterated its old promises of victory, immediate victory, and that honourable peace for which the country was pining, if only the men demanded were produced. They were produced; the promised victory did not materialize, and Germany the nation crumbled behind the German army, which awoke one fine day to discover that it was the army of a Republic and not that of an Emperor. With the lesson of Germany before our eyes, and without the British Prime Minister's knowledge of the industrial situation in Great Britain at the time, we can only abstain from expressing an opinion on this debatable point. The fact that

after the German offensive, and after the people of this country had become aware of the terrible ordeal to which our Fifth Army had been exposed, the country accepted the new man-power Bill, does not justify this entry in Colonel Repington's diary under the date April 6, 1918 :—

' We laughed a good deal about L. G.'s fears of a social revolution and all the rubbish about it of which he delivered himself at Versailles. There is not one murmur in the country.'

When Colonel Repington made that entry in his diary he forgot that his fellow countrymen are never so great as under the shadow of defeat. If men of British blood realize that they are ' fighting with their backs to the wall ' they respond as did Sir Douglas Haig's army and the working men at home to an appeal for further efforts which in other circumstances might well provoke their wrath. Such ignorance of the psychology of our race is a serious defect in a writer who arrogates to himself the right to instruct its rulers how to wage war, a human activity in which ' the moral is to the physical as three is to one.'

On the question of unity of command of the Allied armies on the Western front Colonel Repington has written freely in his diary, and consistently in the sense of his reference to the subject in his article in the *Morning Post* of February 11, 1918, where he says :—

' I can see no good reason for interfering with existing arrangements under which Field-Marshal Sir Douglas Haig and General Pétain each commands his own troops, and all his own troops. . . .'

His predilection is strongly in favour of the voluntary co-operation between independent Allied commanders as exemplified by the relations between Wellington and Blücher in the Waterloo campaign, and by those which subsisted between Marlborough and Prince Eugène in the previous century. Even under the shadow of the impending German offensive in the early spring of 1918 Colonel Repington professes himself satisfied that the arrangements made between the commanders of the French and British armies for mutual assistance in the event of attack were all that the situation demanded. They had this defect however : in the event of both armies being attacked, or of one army being attacked while the other army was held in suspense under threat of immediate attack as in March 1918, there was no authority to

decide whether reserves could be spared and to what extent ; and to ensure by the issue of orders that the urgent needs of one army were in fact met by reinforcements from the other to an extent adequate to meet the requirements of the situation. Two able and experienced commanders might quite well disagree in their appreciations of any given situation, according to their respective estimates of the nature and importance of their own commitments.

Disunity of command in the Western theatre of war had its origin in the orders issued by Lord Kitchener to Field-Marshal Sir John French in August 1914, which contained the following words :—

> ' . . . I wish you distinctly to understand that your command is an entirely independent one, and that you will in no case come in any sense under the orders of any Allied general.'

Nothing could be more clear, and nothing could be more deplorable. One year of war followed another without so far as has been disclosed to the public, any alteration in the principle of complete independence embodied in the original instructions given to the Commander-in-Chief of the British expeditionary force. It may be urged by some that while the British expeditionary force in France was only a small fraction of the French armies in the field it might well have been placed directly under the orders of the French Commander-in-Chief, but that the situation was altered by the increase of our armies ; that so soon as our armies by their very size became the important factor they did become in 1916 it would then have been desirable to withdraw them from the control of the French generalissimo. This argument is at first sight plausible, conceding at first something to commonsense and later something to national susceptibilities. But it burkes the main argument on which those who advocate unity of command base their case, that unity of effort can only be ensured by operations being co-ordinated under a single Commander-in-Chief whose orders have to be obeyed ; while the respective sizes of the armies concerned have nothing to do with the question.

It is not denied that given goodwill on both sides two independent Commanders-in-Chief can achieve perfect co-operation : history proves it, none more clearly than that of the British

army which for long has been wont to co-operate with Allies on European battlefields. But the pages of history are also replete with instances to the contrary. Colonel Repington is rightly scornful of the waging of war by a committee, but even if the committee be reduced to two or three independent Commanders-in-Chief, as he advocates, the arguments against waging war by committee still hold, because it is a slower and less certain process to get agreement between two or three minds than to get a decision by one mind in the operative form of definite orders. We have not seen any strong abstract arguments advanced against the principle of unity of command. On the other hand the practical obstacles encountered by those who advocated it were serious and not to be removed by words or argument. In the end they gave way under the relentless pressure of hard facts hammered in by the initial success of the German offensive in the spring of 1918.

The practical difficulties which for so long blocked the way to unity of command were a natural disinclination to entrust the fate of a national army to any foreigner ; the fear lest any set back should lead to mutual recrimination which might give rise to international mistrust disastrous to the common cause ; a feeling that the appointment of a French generalissimo would be taken to connote want of confidence in the capacity of the Commander-in-Chief of the British armies in France ; and finally, we think, perhaps the most serious obstacle of all, the fact that command implies the power to dismiss : Was General X., a Frenchman, to have the power to remove from his command a field-marshal appointed by the King of England to command a British army ?

The Versailles arrangement was a compromise between frank recognition of disunity of command and full acceptance of the obvious drawbacks to unity of command. It was never operative, but would have had this effect had it ever materialized. A certain number of divisions would have been taken from the reserves of the French and British armies for employment, at the discretion of the Versailles Council, as a general reserve under the orders of General Foch. In any given crisis—such as that which came on March 21—the French and British armies would have been paralysed for lack of reserves, while action to remedy the situation would have devolved on a commander not responsible for the dispositions which were a vital factor in any step he might have to take to recover the initiative. Grand tactics are so poor a

field for experimenting in compromise that we must associate ourselves to the full with the caustic criticism on this compromise which Colonel Repington has recorded.

Fortunately the decisions taken at Versailles were never put to the test. The German attack came while the Allies were still in the stage of disunity of command, with co-operation between commanders. Its immediate, though incomplete success, pricked that bubble. The German attack began on March 21, and on March 26 General Foch was charged by the British and French Governments with the supreme command of the Allied armies on the Western front.

How was the momentous decision brought about? Those who may be tempted to consider 'The First World War' as a *vade mecum* to all that went on behind the scenes will be disappointed if they turn to it for the answer to that question. On March 28 we find that Colonel Repington learns from the newspapers (like any ordinary mortal) that Foch had been made *generalissimo*, and on April 1 he notes in his diary: 'L.G.—or 'is it Clemenceau?—has given the command to Foch, who now 'has the fate of our armies in his hands.' For once this eavesdropper at the doors of the well-informed was guessing: his diary shows that he knew as little as the outer world what happened at Doullens on March 26, 1918, when a decision was taken which altered the course of the war by ensuring unity of command and entrusting to General Foch the conduct of operations on the Western front.

The story of what happened at Doullens was given to the world in the *Sunday Express* of March 28, 1920 in an article which has every appearance of being authoritative.

The story is this: On March 24 Lord Milner—the Secretary of State for War—was sent to France by the War Cabinet to investigate the dangerous situation of the British armies. Next morning he was put in touch with the situation by the British Military Mission at Versailles and at once realised that it was necessary to press General Pétain, the commander-in-chief of the French armies, to take risks and to do his utmost to bring help to Sir Douglas Haig. That afternoon Lord Milner attended a conference at General Pétain's headquarters at Compiègne with the President of the Republic (M. Poincaré), M. Clemenceau and General Foch. At this conference General Pétain explained

his view of the situation, which was strategically sound, and outlined his proposed measures which left his hearers anxious as to whether they were adequate. General Foch then spoke, accepting General Pétain's appreciation of the situation, but urging steps to meet it far more heroic. These he pressed with a fire and eloquence which deeply affected those who heard him. He emphasised the importance of speed in reinforcement and the provision of a far larger number of reinforcing divisions than the figure General Pétain had named if the German push on the danger spot, Amiens, was to be dealt with adequately. To save Amiens he was prepared to take grave risks on the French front. Courage in taking risk and energy in bringing help to an ally were the points he pressed home. M. Clemenceau and M. Poincaré were impressed, and Lord Milner urged on the French statesmen his conviction that General Foch was right.

The conference reassembled at Doullens on March 26, when Sir Douglas Haig and Sir Henry Wilson were able to attend. Lord Milner sounded Sir Douglas Haig and discovered that so far from resenting the idea of General Foch being given the supreme command the Field-Marshal was inclined to welcome it. At the conference Sir Douglas made it clear that he was bringing up every man that could be spared on the British front, even at some risk to its northern sector. The question then arose what did General Pétain propose to do ? At Compiègne he had spoken of fifteen divisions ; he now spoke of twenty-four, but he still left on his hearers an impression of caution and was not comforting as to the speed at which he would be able to reinforce.

The well-informed writer in the *Sunday Express* says :—

'Again, those who heard him were disquieted—dismayed is, perhaps, not too strong a word. General Wilson was moved to muttered protest. Haig was obviously not convinced. General Foch said nothing ; but his silence and his look were not less revealing than his eloquence of the day before.

Here was the crisis, the moment in which great opportunities are seized or missed. The chance was seized, and Lord Milner seized it. Taking M. Clemenceau aside, he proposed directly to him the appointment of General Foch as generalissimo of the French and British armies. Clemenceau, whose mind had worked towards the same conclusion, agreed. Lord Milner spoke apart with Haig ; M. Clemenceau with Pétain. The former consented eagerly, the latter raised no objection.'

It was thus that unity of command on the Western front was achieved.

This, we have reason to believe, is the true story of the Doullens conference. We hope that its disclosure will bring home to the British and French peoples the debt they owe to the brilliant foresight of Lord Milner and to the complete disregard of self which characterised throughout those proceedings the conduct of Field-Marshal Sir Douglas Haig, enabling the decision of Lord Milner and M. Clemenceau to be given effect to without fear of friction.

Within the compass of an article in this REVIEW it has been possible to touch on but few of the innumerable problems presented by four years of conflict by sea and land on a scale so vast that Colonel Repington has been well advised in describing the stupendous struggle as 'The First World War.' It may be hoped, however, that enough has been said to enable the reader to judge for himself to what extent the successive governments which ruled the United Kingdom during the first world war approximated to the standards of Lao Tse in their manifestation of 'brilliant' foresight' and in the quality of the strategy they followed in the conduct of the war.

Those who do not agree with the estimate here given of the strategy of Mr. Lloyd George will perhaps find comfort in this passage from the Tao Teh King,* which appears to be an archaic anticipation of the British gift of winning wars by muddling through to victory :—

> 'If a ruler is in line with Inner Life
> His strategy will come right,
> His bad luck will become good,
> And the people will be astonished.
> Things have been so for a long time.'

* Chap. lviii.

THE BATTLE OF JUTLAND

1. Supplement to the London Gazette of July 6th, 1916.
2. The Grand Fleet, 1914–16. By Admiral Viscount Jellicoe of Scapa. Cassell. 1919.
3. Germany's High Sea Fleet in the War. By Admiral von Scheer. Cassell. 1920.
4. Battle of Jutland. Official Despatches with Appendices. Cmd. 1068. 1920.

Lord Jellicoe's public letter of July 6, 1916, taken with his book 'The Grand Fleet 1914-16,' supplies all the knowledge needed as foundation for a judgment on the Battle of Jutland. Admiral von Scheer confirms the British Commander-in-Chief all through his 'Germany's High Sea Fleet in the War,' and therefore as to the battle. We owe Cmd. 1068 entitled 'Battle of 'Jutland' to the pertinacity of acute persons who were resolved not to be taken in and insisted on a revelation of secrets. The Admiralty, being called on to provide bread for the satisfaction of their appetites, promised to supply a loaf. But difficulties arose over the baking; so My Lords have made a heap of the raw materials, and have presented it to all who care to cook for themselves. The general public will pay just as much attention to these documents with their copious apparatus of maps, in the text and in a separate case, as it usually does to Blue Books. We do not find that they alter our view of the battle, but they do tell us something of certain inward and spiritual influences which helped to shape the course of events.

No one who has even a moderate amount of knowledge of what has been written and said about all battles in all wars, can be in the least surprised that there has been, and is, an angry dispute concerning the encounter between the British and German fleets off the coast of Jutland on May 31, 1916. Few, indeed, have been the victories won by sea or land which have had the good fortune to secure the entire approval of critics. Wisdom comes easily after the event. The judgment which Admiral Boscawen is recorded to have passed on his own engagement with La Clue in 1759, namely, that it was well, but that it might have been better, is generally safe. In a

great majority of cases these discussions are best left to professional gentlemen, for whom they have a real value; since they provide instructive themes, and also a quite legitimate exercise, for the intelligence of officers who may one day be entrusted with a command. When they arise from personal rivalries they are good to leave alone. But the question concerning the Battle of Jutland cannot be ignored—honourably, or even safely. It is very serious, and touches the nation and the navy on the quick. When we go to the essential meaning of the dispute we find that what has to be decided is no less than this :—

Was the Battle of Jutland a true victory ? Was it not rather a failure to win such a measure of success as might—and, since it might, ought to—have been won ? If there was a failure, was it not due to misdirection of the battle on the part of Sir John Jellicoe, as he then was ? Supposing that we rest content with such victory as there was, shall we not consent to the setting up of a poor standard of conduct ? And, if we are so slothful as to fold our hands to sleep, maundering that it was well, when it might—and, therefore, ought to—have been far better, is there not a real danger that we shall prepare evil for the future ?

If we have to say ' Yes ' to any one of the enquiries, then we cannot take the Battle of Jutland too seriously, nor look into it too closely. The temptation to rest and be thankful is great. Was it not well on and after May 31, 1916 ? We not only can, but we must agree with the just estimate of the place the battle holds in the war, given by Captain Thomas G. Frothingham, U.S.R.*

' As a matter of fact, the Battle of Jutland did not have any actual effect upon the situation on the seas. The British fleet still controlled the North Sea. The Entente Allies were still able to move their troops and supplies over waterways which were barred to the Germans. Not a German ship was released from port, and there was no effect upon the blockade. After Jutland, as before, the German fleet was confined to its bases, except for occasional sorties into the North Sea. . . . The Jutland action had cheered the German people, but it had not given to Germany even a fragment of sea power.'

* ' A guide to the Military History of the World War,' by Thomas G. Frothingham, Captain U.S.R. Published by Messrs. Little, Brown and Co., Boston, U.S.A., 1920. A book to be recommended to a reader who wishes to see the whole wood, and *not* to be confused by the trees.

Now, this is a quite accurate statement in what is said, and no less judicious in what is left unsaid. After the battle, as before, the German fleet was ' still ' a force which was potentially dangerous. It was ' still ' so strong that the main power of the British Navy was tied down to keep watch lest it should do us a damage in the North Sea. It was still able to do great hurt to our Russian ally. Was this negative result, this mere demonstration that the German fleet could not win a stricken field, and, therefore, could not raise the blockade, nor cut the transport of troops and supplies, nor drive the British Navy off the North Sea, all the country had a right to expect ?

We must allow that there was some reason why the country should have been disturbed when the first official announcement was published. No one who read his paper on the morning of June 3, 1916, with the least attention, can forget that he was stung by a most unpleasant twinge. The Admiralty report had a disturbing air of having been artfully worded to prepare him for worse news. So the first seeds of doubt, of a sense of disappointment, of dissatisfaction, were planted. They took root and began to grow below the surface. The removal of the censorship gave the growth free access to the air, and they have borne a large crop. One of the minor (but, not wholly unimportant) questions left for the minute historian in the future is : who were the official gentlemen of some importance at the time, whose nerves were badly ' rattled ' during those early June days ; and who blabbed their fears ? Nothing was more natural than that the country should be made to feel disenchanted and anxious by what it was told. For twenty months the Germans had not sought battle. The graver kind of authorities who addressed the public had repeated, day after day, the welcome assurance that the irresistible superiority of the British fleet was proved to demonstration by the manifest reluctance of the enemy to risk a trial of strength. Other teachers of a less magisterial, but more popular order, were telling all who would listen that the Germans were cowards who fought with babies only. Comic journalists had been pouring out pictures of absurd creatures, addle-headed, blear-eyed, pot-bellied, knock-kneed. These were the Germans. If these wretched objects dared to face the British tars they would be cleared off the surface of the sea in one ' hurricane sweep.'

People would not, of course, have confessed that they took all this loud hee-hawing and guffawing seriously—but it told. And now, all at once, a public carefully prepared to expect only unqualified triumph was compelled to learn that the two fleets had met ; that the British fleet had suffered heavy loss ; that the German fleet was not destroyed ; but that our own naval authorities could only affirm, with no convincing appearance of confidence, that the enemy had suffered about as much loss as he had inflicted. Disappointment was but the natural product of the non-fulfilment of high expectations.

To say that a common sentiment is natural is far from being the same as saying that it is reasonable. Before deciding whether there was any excuse for the inclination of many among us to think that the Battle of Jutland was no victory, since it ended in a failure to do what ought to have been done, we must first be clear as to certain matters of fact. And then we must be no less clear as to certain matters of principle. The matters of fact are : the relative strengths of the two fleets ; and the events of the battle, at least the great and dominant events which carry the little ones with them.

Now, there can be no dispute that the force under the command of Admiral Jellicoe was very superior in numbers, and in some ways in quality. The commander-in-chief of the Grand Fleet had with his flag 41 vessels, which we will venture to class together as ' capital ships.' The list was made up of 28 battleships, 9 battle cruisers, and 4 armoured cruisers. He had also 103 ' ancillary craft,' made up of 25 light cruisers, and 78 destroyers. The German fleet consisted of 22 battleships and 5 battle cruisers, or 27 capital ships ; there were also 11 light cruisers, and 88 destroyers. This statement of numbers is of itself a mere counting of noses. The Grand Fleet might have surpassed the enemy in numbers, and still not have been the stronger if the weight of their guns, and the qualities of their ships of all classes, including that of speed, had counterbalanced the numerical inferiority of the Germans.

But there was no such compensation for our enemy, nor an approach to one. The armament of the Grand Fleet amounted to 362 great guns as compared to 244 in the German fleet—more ships meant, of course, more guns ; and, even if the pieces had been equal, this was a vast superiority in the power

to inflict blows. They were not equal : 142 of the British guns were of 13.5 inch calibre, and 48 were of 15 inches ; none were of less than 12 inches. In the German ships there were 20 guns of 10 inch calibre, and the others were all of 11 or 12 inches. The relative capacity of guns to do damage is not to be measured by the inches of their calibres, but by the weight of their projectiles. The real proportion between a 12 inch and a 13.5 inch gun is not as 12 is to 13.5, but as 850-lbs. is to 1,400-lbs. So the superiority of the Grand Fleet in power to smash was greater than in its numbers. Then Admiral Jellicoe's command had a most important superiority in speed, not because none of the German ships could steam as fast as the most rapid of the British, but because 6 of the 22 battleships under the German admiral's command were pre-Dreadnoughts, and were slow. When a number of ships, or for that matter of men or taxicabs, are to be kept together, they must regulate their speed by that of the slowest among them. The ancillary craft of the British fleet were larger than the German as a rule, and more heavily armed. Our enemy had certain advantages. His destroyers were fitted with more torpedo tubes. His battleships being constructed with more beam could be better protected to stand hammering. But it would have required a combination of better superiorities in detail to counterbalance the dominating fact that the total weight of projectiles in the British fleet was 420,600-lbs. to 216,264 in the German ; while our tonnage was 1,139,000 to their 590,000.

It is not unreasonable to ask how it came to pass that an encounter between the two could end in such a way that it was possible to give an account of the action which could leave a cheering effect on the German public. The explanation that they were deceived by mere lies really won't do. A government (we know that much without having to go abroad for proofs) can mislead its people in many ways, by ' economies of truth ' as well as by downright falsities. But there are limits to its power to deceive. Not even the German Admiralty and censorship could have persuaded their docile people that Admiral von Scheer's ships were still in existence, with but a few exceptions, if they were not. Moreover, it was a fact that the German fleet was out again in August, and that the bulk of ours was still not thought too much to keep watch on it. The Germans had cause to be

pleased when it was shown that their outnumbered and outclassed navy could meet the Grand Fleet in battle, and could not only escape the annihilation which on a comparison of forces seemed to be the inevitable result of an encounter, but could inflict more loss than it suffered. It was perfectly natural that they should attribute their escape from apparently unavoidable disaster to the skill of their admiral and the good behaviour of his officers and men. It is not enough to assert that they were wrong. Nor is it enough to insist that after the battle, as before, the British fleet commanded the North Sea. There is a degree of superiority of numbers and mere material weight which will give victory. All Nelson's skill, with all the valour and good seamanship of his captains, would not have saved his isolated handful of ships at Naples from being crushed if Admiral Bruix had fallen on them in 1799 with the whole fleet he brought into the Mediterranean. Are we to rest content with thanking the fortune of England that we could always fight with a material superiority of two or three to one in our favour ? Let us try to take Dr. Johnson's advice and clear our minds of cant. What lies under all boasting founded on the command of greater numbers is the tacit, but not the less pitiful because tacit, confession that if we had fought an adversary of our own weight we should have won no victory at all. It is fair, and it is good sense to use all your resources to win. But it is not fair, and it is not sense, to be proud of successes which are not due to better spirit and better mastery of the weapons.

It is one thing to recognise that the degree of success won fell short of rational expectation ; but it is quite another to assume without further examination of the evidence, that the admiral in command is to be justly blamed for having done less than he might. If Calder's action with Villeneuve was truly described by Sir Gilbert Elliot (the Governor-General Lord Minto of later days) as ' half begotten,' the reason is that the admiral might so easily have done better. Moreover, it was manifest that he was unduly influenced by the desire to safeguard two prizes, which (we again quote Sir Gilbert) Nelson would have sent to the bottom of the sea rather than allow them to hamper his fleet—though he did thereby sacrifice his own tenth of the prize money, and the shares of his officers and men. But no honest critic would have blamed Calder if he could have been shown to have done all

that the circumstances in which he fought allowed him to do. The question of the Battle of Jutland is precisely whether no more could have been effected, and before an answer can be given we must first see what did happen ; not in all the details—of which the vast majority are consequential or dependent—but in the main lines.

On the morning of May 31, 1916, the two fleets started on the cruise which was to bring them to the long-deferred battle. There was no clear expectation on the British side that a meeting would ensue ; nor could there be a definite intention on the German side to force on an action with the whole British fleet. Lord Jellicoe intended to carry out one of those ' sweeps ' of the North Sea, which served to display our power and keep the fleet in training. Admiral von Scheer makes it clear enough that he played for a chance to do something in the way of damaging our trade, and perhaps to catch an isolated part of the Grand Fleet which he could overpower. That was his intention. We need not now ask what was his motive in hazarding his whole command—for, hazard there was, and he was far too intelligent not to be well aware of that fact. On either side the fleets were divided into a main body (our ancestors would have called it a ' battle ') and an advance force or species of grand guard. The British fleet advanced from a starting line drawn from Wick to the opposite coast of Norway. It was composed of 24 Dreadnoughts with an attendant swarm of cruisers and destroyers. The advance force was made up of 6 battle cruisers under Sir David Beatty, supported by 4 huge battleships—Queen Elizabeths or Barhams is the class name—armed with 15-inch guns, which have a projectile weighing 1,900-lbs. They were supposed to be able to attain to a speed of twenty-five knots an hour. The cruisers could work up to twenty-six, and still keep together. They also had their suite of ancillary cruisers and destroyers. This advance force was forty miles to the south of the main body. The Germans started for the north from the Heligoland Bight. The advance squadron weighed anchor at daybreak. It consisted of 5 battle cruisers, with light craft and destroyers. Behind it at a distance of fifty miles came the German main fleet of 16 Dreadnoughts and 6 pre-Dreadnoughts. These half-dozen older ships could steam only seventeen knots an hour, and therefore regulated the speed of the Dreadnoughts. And there was the needful protecting

fringe of cruisers and destroyers. To the lay mind it appears self-evident that when you are engaged on an operation in which speed is of the first degree of importance, there is a certain foolishness in taking slow goers with you. Admiral von Scheer says he had his doubts as to whether it was wise to take the pre-Dreadnoughts, but tells us that he could not bear to hurt the feelings of officers and men by leaving them behind. He adds that he had no cause to regret his decision. As things turned out, perhaps he had not ; but, it is not spiteful to guess that, like most admirals and generals, von Scheer was not ready to believe that he had enough when he could, even at a risk, obtain more.

The meeting of the advance squadrons began when both were on a level with the northern end of Jutland—the Scaw. We do not undertake to give full details, and are content to note what we consider essential. Admiral Hipper, who commanded the German cruisers, swung round from north to south and made his best speed towards the main body of his countrymen which was coming up behind him. He was to the east of Sir David Beatty. The time was for us 2.20 p.m., and for the enemy 4.20 (for we went by British summer time, which is one hour earlier than Greenwich mean time ; and they by Berlin mean time, which is one hour later). There was a good deal of the haze usual in the North Sea to the eastward, and all smoke drifted in that direction, to the advantage of the Germans, who were shrouded by it, while we were in the light. The vast battle-ships of Rear-Admiral H. Evan Thomas's squadron were (the reason does not concern us here) too far behind Sir David to be able to take an effective part in this phase of the battle. The two battle cruiser squadrons ran on to the south firing at one another. Sir David Beatty edged in towards the Germans to cut them off —if so he might. They sent out destroyers to fend Sir David off by torpedo attacks if possible, and drove on knowing that they were nearing support, which was approaching them at the combined speed of the two, *i.e.* about forty-five miles an hour. One hour would decide their fate for the present. In the meantime, their destroyers helped to hold the British cruisers off, and to cover Admiral Hipper with a screen of smoke. During that hour two British battle cruisers blew up while they were under the German fire.

At 4.42 p.m. the main body of the enemy was seen coming

up to support its advance force. Sir David Beatty swung round to the north. The four heavy battleships of Admiral Evan Thomas's division fell in behind him. Admiral Hipper also turned to the north. The eight battle cruisers and battleships of the British line now began to fall back on the main body of the grand fleet. Hitherto, as they pressed in pursuit of the Germans to the south, they had increased their distance from the Commander-in-Chief. Now they were approaching him at a combined speed. But the four surviving battle cruisers and the Queen Elizabeths were stronger than the German ships opposed to them, and were more swift. There was no reason why Admiral Beatty should make a mere retreat, and he did not. He pressed on the enemy, forcing him to turn to the eastward. As the British ships gained on them the German ships were compelled to turn. If they had not they would have exposed themselves to the whole British broadsides, while they could only use a part of their own guns. Sir David 'crossed the T,' putting the German van inside the curve made by the British ships, and thereby subjecting them to a concentrated fire, placing his squadrons on the enemy's line of retreat to Heligoland, and depriving his opponent of the advantage so far given him by the haze and drifting smoke to the east. The position of the two combatants as to visibility was reversed.

While the advance squadrons were gaining this advantage of position, the main fleet was coming forward. It was arranged in an order from which it could be drawn out to engage. The formation in which ships can fight, so as to make use of all their strength is dictated by physical necessities, and has therefore been used by commanders at sea from the beginning of naval warfare. These necessities, imposed by the nature of things, are quite excellently defined in the battle orders issued by the Earl of Northumberland in 1636: 'Every ship is to keep such a 'distance that they hinder not one another, and that they be sure 'not to hurt any of our fleet with their ordnance; nor come 'foul of one another.' A little common sense is enough to show any man that if ships which carry guns on their sides are to comply with these manifestly sensible directions there is only one formation in which they can be placed. They must follow one another. This is the imperative order which, somewhat after the Earl's day, was named the line of battle, and the line ahead.

But, when a fleet was not actually marshalled for battle there was a convenience in arranging it in divisions, composed of ships in line ahead, but themselves side by side, or abreast. This was known as the order of sailing. To-day we naturally say, of steaming. On May 31 the main body of the Grand Fleet was arranged in six divisions of four battleships each. They steamed side by side, forming an oblong, of which the long sides were the north and the south, the short the east and west. In each division the vessels followed one another. The cruisers and destroyers were out in front to right and to left, and on either side. While still in this order the main fleet came into contact—not with the enemy, but with the advance squadrons of Sir David Beatty and Admiral Evan Thomas, which were engaged on the east side of the German line. They had forced its head round, and were steaming south hotly engaged, when the short western end of the oblong ' order of steaming ' of the main fleet with cruisers and destroyers showed out of mist and smoke to the east of them. They were, therefore, between the British and German fleets. And now the case had arisen when it behoved the Commander-in-Chief to look sharply to it that his ships did not fire so as to hurt one another with their ordnance.

We were assured now and again during the months before the battle, and by persons who professed to speak on the authority of Sir John Jellicoe, that the British fleet would engage when it chose, and as it chose. But for the many millionth time in all the history of war, fortune, a convenient name for the unforeseen, took its share. The commander-in-chief would certainly not have preferred to come within striking distance at a moment when part of his own force was so placed as to obstruct his fire, nor yet while the bulk of his fleet was not so placed as to be able to engage at once. That he was met by this double disability shows, what ought to have needed no showing, that time and chance happen to all men, and that cock-sure prophets are habitually mistaken. While Sir John Jellicoe was nearing the bank of mist and smoke, illuminated transiently by flashes of fire, wherein Sir David Beatty and Admiral Evan Thomas were at hand-grips with the enemy, he was kept informed of their movements and positions by wireless telegraphy. But the messages came from ships in rapid motion, which were continually altering their courses. Therefore—but let us hear Sir John Jellicoe himself :—

'Obviously, however, great reliance could not be placed on the positions given by the ships of the Battle Cruiser Fleet which had been in action for two hours and frequently altering course. I realised this, but when contact actually took place it was found that the positions given were at least twelve miles in error when compared with the 'Iron Duke's' reckoning. The result was that the enemy's battle fleet appeared on the starboard bow (*i.e.*, to the west) instead of ahead, as I had expected, and contact also took place earlier than was anticipated.'

The unforeseen, as is most usual in all war, and not least on the sea, had happened. Sir John Jellicoe had calculated, and had had good ground to calculate, that an enemy whose starting points were to the east, would be found to the east. So the two strongest of the six divisions of the main fleet were posted on that side of the order of steaming, where they would be best placed to come instantly into play. As it turned out, they were not the nearest to the enemy, but the farthest off. There were two simple ways in which the fleet could deploy and join battle. The easier of the two was that the division on the western side of the oblong—the starboard division—should fall in behind the Queen Elizabeths of Admiral Evan Thomas, and the others behind it. Sir John was, he tells us, well inclined to take that course. Admiral Evan Thomas thought he would. But on mature consideration, the Commander-in-Chief decided to deploy from the port, or eastern division. It would stretch ahead and the others would fall in behind in order, and the whole would go towards the enemy on slanting lines—or, to use a useful word, which ought never to have been dropped, 'lasking.'

Now, the most modest common sense is equal to understanding that if the main fleet was to come into action the water which was then being crossed by the advance squadrons must be left clear. The case presented no real difficulty. The battle cruisers could press on rapidly. Admiral Evan Thomas's squadron would turn back to the north, and the main fleet could slow down a little to allow time for the clearance. When Admiral Evan Thomas saw how the Commander-in-Chief meant to deploy, which he did when he noted the movements of the port division, he made the necessary turn. The battle cruisers stood on, the main fleet, slowing down for so long as was necessary, fell into position, and the line of battle was formed by about half-past six.

If it were our task to endeavour to give a full account of the

battle, a multitude of incidents would call for record, and four or five times as many pages as we have at our disposal would be needed. We must confine ourselves to the general movements. The German fleet, when it found that the main British force was on it, had also turned to the southward. It was hard pressed, and did not hold on directly to the south, but flinched away to south-west and west. In the days of the sailing fleets the weaker side preferred to engage on the lee side, so that the wind blew towards it from its enemy. Then it would try to cripple its opponent's spars, and could go off before the wind. The answer to this device was easy. The fleet to windward could push the attack home, could dispense with its own order, and make a ' general chase '—that is to say, every ship could go at its best speed without regard to order, overtake the enemy, break into lines, and bring about a mêlée. To-day the same purpose has to be achieved by other means on the part of the weaker fleet, and the stronger has not an equally obvious retort. The side which has to fight a battle in retreat can cover itself by the aid of its destroyers, partly by employing them to fend off the assailant with torpedoes, and partly by setting them to send out clouds of artificially exaggerated smoke, which make a screen. Behind that cover which conceals it from hostile gunners it can try to slip away. It can also drop mines. If, now, the stronger fleet attempts to close, to carry out ' a general chase,' and therefore plunges into the manufactured fog of smoke, it incurs the obvious risk that it will run on the torpedoes and mines.

We have to figure to ourselves the whole swarm of more than two hundred British and German craft of all sorts and sizes, driving along to south-west and curving to west ; the first pressing hard, the second flinching away ; each hitting as hard as it could, but in the obscurity made up of North Sea haze and chemically-bred smoke both hitting in a prevailing dark, which allowed of but passing and irregular chances of observation. We believed that our fire, hampered as it was, did yet do great injury. Spirited and zealous officers commanding destroyers, who were doing their utmost to torpedo the enemy, honestly believed that they had. Of course, they were convinced that they had not toiled and run great risks in vain. They were men born of women ; and, like the rest of us, disposed to believe that what they greatly wished—and had striven hard to make true—was in fact the truth. But,

when the sun was down and full darkness had come on, the German fleet damaged, and that badly in the case of some of the ships, yet not seriously diminished in numbers, was still fighting its retreating battle.

Some among us who seem to hold that a loud tone of jeer is a sign of high spirit, have thought fit to assert that the Germans were in a sheer panic. I have to confess to my total inability to see a jot of evidence that they were. They, too, were men born of women, and they felt the strain. The naval officer who wrote under the *nom de guerre* 'Etienne,' tells us that he had seen strong men go frantic in the horrors of battle, and throw themselves overboard. It is easy to believe that individual Germans sank by the weakness of human nature, but that any of their officers, from Admiral von Scheer downwards, who exercised a controlling authority in ship or squadron, so lost possession of himself as not to be able to take the best measures to save what was entrusted to his care from a very great danger, is not proved, nor is it probable. The mere fact that the German fleet did extricate itself from the grip of a vastly superior force, after inflicting more injury than it suffered, is proof positive that its chiefs did not lose their heads, and that its crews kept their discipline.

Whether it was allowed to get off is just the whole question of the Battle of Jutland, and it is not easy to answer. The facts are not really in dispute. The debate is over the real meaning of the facts. It is best to begin our attempt to find an answer by starting from solid ground. Here is the Commander-in-Chief's own statement as to how the battle ended, taken from his despatch :—

> 'At 9 p.m. the enemy was entirely out of sight, and the threat of torpedo boat destroyer attacks during the rapidly approaching darkness made it necessary for me to dispose the fleet for the night with a view to its safety from such attacks whilst providing for a renewal of the action at daylight. I accordingly manœuvred to remain between the enemy and his bases, placing our flotillas in a position in which they would afford protection to the fleet from destroyer attack, and, at the same time be favourably situated for attacking the enemy's heavy ships.'

If there is any meaning in the English language, what this comes to is just this : That at 9 p.m. the Commander-in-Chief thought it wiser to break off action with the main fleet lest it should be too roughly handled. He broke off action since he did

not follow the enemy, though there was not a doubt as to the direction in which they were retreating. And we have to make our minds up as to whether we think he did well to break it off, or not. In his ' Grand Fleet ' Lord Jellicoe gives his reasons for not following the German High Sea Fleet, and tells us what he preferred to do. He has a right to be heard, and is our one sure authority. The passage is somewhat long, but quotation will spare report and is more fair.

' The situation, which had never been really clear to me, owing to the fact that I had not seen more than a few ships at a time, appeared to be as follows :—

' We were between the enemy and his bases, whether he shaped a course to return via the Horn Reef, via Heligoland direct, or via the swept channel, which he was known to use along the coast of the West Frisian Islands.

' I concluded that the enemy was well to the westward of us. He had been turning on interior lines throughout. We had altered course gradually during the action from south-east by east to west, a turn of 13 points, or 146 degrees in all ; and the result must have been to place his ships well to the westward, and ahead of us ; although it was possible that ships which had fallen out owing to damage might be to the westward.

' The possibility of a night-action was, of course, present to my mind ; but for several reasons it was not my intention to seek such an action between the heavy ships.

' It is sufficient to mention the principal arguments against it.

' In the first place, such a course must have inevitably led to our battle fleet being the object of attack by a very large destroyer force throughout the night. No senior officer would willingly court such an attack ; even if our battleships were equipped with the best searchlights, and the best arrangements for the control of the searchlights and the gunfire at night.

' It was, however, known to me that neither our searchlights nor their control arrangements were at this time of the best type. The fitting of director-firing gear for the guns of secondary armaments of our battleships (a very important factor for firing at night) had also only just been begun ; although repeatedly applied for, the delay was due to manufacturing and labour difficulties. Without these adjuncts, I knew well that the maximum effect of our fire at night could not be obtained, and that we could place no dependence on beating off destroyer attacks by gunfire. Therefore, if destroyers got into touch with the heavy ships, we were bound to suffer serious losses, with no corresponding advantage. Our own destroyers were no effective antidote at night, since, if they were disposed with this sole object in view, they would certainly be taken for enemy destroyers, and be fired on by our own ships.

'But, putting aside the question of attack by destroyers, the result of night actions between heavy ships must always be very largely a matter of chance, as there is little opportunity for skill on either side. Such an action must be fought at very close range, the decision depending on the course of events in the first few minutes. It is, therefore, an undesirable procedure on these general grounds. The greater efficiency of German searchlights at the time of the Jutland action, and the greater number of torpedo tubes fitted in enemy ships, combined with his superiority in destroyers, would, I knew, give the Germans the opportunity of scoring heavily at the commencement of such an action.'

The first sentence of this quotation is illuminating. We see, and shall do well to bear in mind, that when darkness fell on the evening of May 31, the Commander-in-Chief did not *know* how his own fleet and the enemy lay to one another ; but could only deduce probabilities from the little he had been able to see. This is an important element of the case, and one which no honest critic should neglect. We have no sympathy, but very much the contrary, with those self-confident persons, who, sitting in the light which falls on all men after the event, are so ready to assert that Lord Jellicoe could—and, therefore, ought to—have done other and better than he did. Nor have we an ounce of respect for pedantic prate about the supposed two schools of strategy—the material and the historic. During the Lepanto campaign, Don John of Austria had many opportunities to learn that certain fluent critics were finding fault with him. He dismissed them with a piece of good sense in idiomatic Castilian : 'hablan desde la talanquera pero yo sudando lo que digo.' They talk from the top of the barrier (of the bull ring), but I, with the sweat of my brow. The critics who play cricket in the pavilion fight the Battle of Jutland over again on paper, which puts up with everything. Lord Jellicoe fought with the sweat of his brow and in conflict with the nature of things, a very exacting task-master. All the considerations he notes in the passage we have quoted are such as ought to have been present in the mind of a Commander-in-Chief. The deduction he drew was not absurd. It would be presumptuous to say that he failed to do what was good.

And yet, without taking upon oneself to condemn, one can feel a certain doubt whether what was done was 'best.' We leave aside the very technical point of the deployment with this

remark only. It was surely unfortunate that the main fleet came into contact with the enemy in such a way that time, which at that late hour was of immense importance, was lost in clearing the way for, and forming the line. It looks as if what was gained on the swings was lost on the roundabouts. But, whatever course was taken at that moment the result would, apparently, not have been very different. An enemy who knew he must retreat, and was retreating, would have been in no position to take advantage of the confusion which Lord Jellicoe believed must have occurred if he deployed from the starboard division. Even as it was, a chance was given him by the ' bunching,' which did take place on Lord Jellicoe's own showing, in the main fleet as it deployed by the port division. Admiral von Scheer got off—on that point there can be no question—because the Grand Fleet did not stick to him, but turned away from him, and went to the south, thereby leaving him—who was already to north-west—an opening to turn east and cross the rear of the Grand Fleet as it stood to the south, and so escape to safety. This is the course which Admiral von Scheer took, and so rescued his over-matched fleet. We are not persuaded that it was necessary to leave him the opening.

As we read Lord Jellicoe's narrative and ' apologia ' (for that it is, in substance and in tone) we constantly find him dwelling on the harm the enemy could do to his ships, and never referring to what they could do to the enemy. A certain timid, not to say awful, respect for the Germans leaks out of Lord Jellicoe's narratives. He does not seem ever to have looked at the problem in the spirit of that Austrian field marshal, Loudon, who, when one of his subordinates complained that the rain was damping the priming of his soldiers' muskets, reminded him ' that the rain ' was also falling on the Prussians.' The ' rain ' which Lord Jellicoe foresaw might fall on his fleet, was quite as likely to fall on Admiral von Scheer's. A searchlight may reveal the presence of a target to the man who turns it on, but it more certainly shows the position of the ship from which it starts. For that very reason the Germans were chary in turning on searchlights. If our destroyers must run the hazard of being fired on by their own side, was not the risk equally serious for ' the Prussians ' ? If chance must play a great part in a night-battle, were not our officers and men as capable of seizing it quickly as our opponents ? When in the passage we have quoted and various others, Lord

Jellicoe—unconsciously, of course, but quite visibly—assumes that all the loss must have fallen on his own fleet and none on the enemy, we really cannot follow him. It is certain, in our opinion, that though the Grand Fleet would probably have suffered, and even heavily, at the hands of a desperate and skilful antagonist, the German fleet would have been utterly destroyed.

It is, of course, open to any man to reply that the loss would not have been compensated by a sufficient gain. Again we cannot agree. The escape of the German fleet gave a great and intelligible encouragement to our enemy. It left in existence a force which had to be watched by the bulk of our fleet. It also left in existence a multitude of well-trained officers and men, from whom the crews of the submarines were drawn in the course of the campaign which did infinite damage to our shipping. When Lord Jellicoe, and others who support him, insist that he had to make the preservation of his fleet—on which the safety of the country depended—the dominating consideration, they are taking a humble view. They assume, to begin with, that all the loss would have been ours, which is contrary to probability ; and is not, to say the least of it, complimentary to the British fleet. Nor do they seem to understand that if the German Dreadnoughts and pre-Dreadnoughts had been utterly destroyed, even at a cost of ship for ship, no German fleet would have been left, and there would still have been a large margin in our favour. No battle ever ends in this wholesale destruction on the open seas. Whatever we succeeded in doing a remnant of German ships would probably have escaped. But it would have been a mere remnant, if our attack had been pushed home to the last, and the Grand Fleet would certainly not have lost twenty-two battleships. So, on the whole, we have to come to the conclusion that we have occasion to quote Boscawen : ' It was well, but it might have ' been better.'

If the end *could* not have been all we hoped, the reason for the failure must be looked for not only in the conditions as they were when darkness came down on the fleets, but in certain influences which had long been at work in the directing mind of the Commander-in-Chief. Lord Jellicoe himself constrains us to recognise that this was the case. At the very end of the official ' Battle of Jutland ' we read a despatch written by him to the Admiralty on October 30, 1914. In this document he sets

forth the principles which were to guide him in seeking, or accepting, and in conducting a battle with the German fleet. We need not quote more than a few words which are relevant to our subject. After noting certain aspects of what might be expected to happen he goes on to say :—

> ' If for instance the enemy battlefleet were to turn away from an advancing fleet I should assume that the intention was to lead us over mines and submarines, *and should decline to be so drawn*.'

The italics are his own. Lord Jellicoe allows that this decision to abstain from pursuit ' may be deemed a refusal of ' battle.' What else could it be called ? But he was resolved to follow the course which he held to be wise ' without regard to ' uninstructed opinion or criticism.' Lord Jellicoe shows the candour becoming an officer and a gentleman. There is a high magnanimity in his determination to do what he thought right, and to take the whole responsibility on himself, careless of hostile outcries. Yet we cannot but see that this resolution of his made it all but certain that any encounter with the German fleet must come to an inconclusive end. The enemy would always bear away behind smoke screens, and if the British fleet was not to follow, then he would escape destruction—as he did.

If this unsatisfactory termination was unavoidable ; if no more could be done ; if the principles Lord Jellicoe lays down are to govern future battles, then we must prepare ourselves for a certain consequence. All encounters of fleets in future will tend to be repetitions of those feeble parades which took place in days when British admirals were tied down by the instructions not only to bring their fleets into action in a line, but to keep them in a line, which made it impossible for them to break in upon and catch hold of the enemy. In the late war our superiority in numbers and geographical position was so great that a tame ending to the only naval battle fought was perhaps no serious misfortune. But can we rely on enjoying these advantages in future and everywhere ? And if we do not what must be the result of acting on a doctrine which will render us incapable of destroying the hostile forces we do meet at sea ? Incapable we certainly shall be if we are to decline to follow an enemy when he draws off.

Within the last few years there has grown up a theory which contains the germs of the destruction of our naval supremacy.

It is that a British admiral is to think of the control of the sea, of communications, of the safety of his fleet, and of the country ; and must therefore look upon a battle as a risk to be avoided rather than sought. How is the sea to be controlled (which control includes everything else) more surely than by the destruction of the fighting forces of the enemy ? We can understand well enough that there is a foundation for this new doctrine. The under-surface attack has come into existence since the days when Hawke took his ships into Quiberon Bay and shattered the French fleet in the midst of a November gale and in the dark. But a new peril is not to be overcome by shrinking away from it. And what part have the torpedo and the submarine played in the only battles we have to look to for instruction—the one in the Sea of Japan, and the other on the coast of Jutland ? A very insignificant one indeed. To-day, as of old, the cannon has been ' the Queen of the Battle.' Fear of the scientific weapon —so called—threatens to unman us. If it is to set us fighting as our enemies fought us in the eighteenth century, reluctantly, with reserve, with our eyes for ever turning over our shoulders to look at the line of retreat, it will be a poison and a curse.

David Hannay.

PSYCHOTHERAPY AND WAR EXPERIENCE

1. Studien über Hysteria. By SIGMUND FREUD, LL.D. 1895.
2. The Interpretation of Dreams. By SIGMUND FREUD, LL.D. Translated by A. A. BRILL, M.D. Revised Edition. George Allen & Unwin. 1915.
3. Contributions to Psychoanalysis. By Dr. S. FERENCZI. Stanley Phillips. 1916.
4. Psychoanalysis. By ERNEST JONES, M.D. Baillière, Tindall & Cox. Revised Edition. 1918.
5. War Neuroses. By JOHN T. MCCURDY, M.D. Cambridge: University Press. 1918.
6. The Child's Unconscious Mind. By WILFRED LAY, Ph.D. Kegan Paul. 1919.
7. Delusion and Dream. By SIGMUND FREUD, LL.D. Translated by H. M. DOWNEY. Moffat, Yard & Co. 1919.
8. International Journal of Psychoanalysis. Volume 1, Part 1. 1920.

THE publication in 1895 of Freud and Breuer's 'Studien 'über Hysteria' marks the beginning of a new conception of mental processes and a theory of conduct which, in spite of bitter hostility in the earlier years, and serious interruption by the war in later years, have increasingly met with acceptance, and now attract interest in all civilized countries. The psychological principles upon which this movement is based were deduced in the first place from observations made during the treatment of persons suffering from hysteria and kindred types of nervous disorder, and it was in medicine that they found their earliest and most immediately practical applications. As the work progressed, however, it became clear that the principles had an application far wider than the sphere of therapeutics and touched every branch of study which involves examination of the human mind. With their assistance new and stimulating light has been thrown upon many problems in anthropology, education, mythology, literature, and history. To cite, merely for the purpose of showing how wide is the range of the new psychology, a few of the names and works of those who have applied its principles, Freud himself has published studies of Leonardo da Vinci and Hamlet, and in his 'Delusion 'and Dream' has made an analysis of Jensen's novel 'Gradiva,' the novel and the analysis forming a fascinating volume which

may be confidently recommended to those who imagine that Freud's work deals only with animal impulses. The same author, in ' Totem and Taboo,' has thrown new light upon the psychological origin of various customs in primitive races and their counterparts among cultured peoples. Wilfred Lay has applied the principles to the study of education and the development of the mind of the child ; C. J. Jung to mythology and its relation to cravings in modern people ; Karl Abraham to dreams and myth ; Franz Ricklin to fairy tales ; Ernest Jones to symbolism ; William A. White to the formation of character ; J. C. Flugel to moral development and to the interpretation of history, for example in his ' Character and Married Life of Henry VIII.'

Besides these serious contributions to thought, we find popular novelists deliberately basing their work upon Freudian psychological principles, though none with the degree of success attained, wholly unconsciously, by Jensen ; while every would-be cultured person endeavours to show his or her acquaintance with ' complexes,' ' suppression,' and psychoanalysis, and the interpretation of dreams becomes a drawing-room pastime.

It must not be supposed from the foregoing that the views of Freud, either in their entirety or in detail, have received anything like universal assent. In particular, controversy has centred round the part played by matters pertaining to sex in the Freudian philosophy. Dr. Alfred Adler, of Vienna, for example, finds as the basis of neurotic disorders a feeling of inferiority such as may originate from a bodily defect present in early life or from a sickly childhood. Dr. C. J. Jung, the founder of the Zurich school of psychotherapy, is however better regarded in the popular mind as the great protagonist of Freud. Without attempting to outline his views, it may be said that Jung differs from Freud mainly in that he attaches less importance to the sex factor as a motive in conduct, and that he insists upon the recognition of moral influences in the subconscious mind as shown by the teleological aspect of dreams. Thus Jung's doctrines are to a large extent shorn of that element which has from the beginning aroused opposition to Freud's teachings, and still renders them unacceptable to many. In these circumstances, it may be useful to examine the most recent results of medical treatment of neurotic disorders by methods based upon recognition of the influence of the subconscious mind, for, as already pointed

out, the new ideas had an entirely medical origin, and it is in the sphere of medicine that practical tests of the truth of the theories are most possible. A melancholy opportunity for such tests on a large scale has been provided by the unexpectedly high number of men whose nerves gave way under the strain of war, and who were invalided out or discharged from the army with various forms of neurotic disorders grouped broadly together under the term ' shell-shock.' Before however noting and describing the results of treatment, it is necessary, in order that the most controversial point—the influence of sex—may be adequately considered, to set out briefly certain of the Freudian views, though of course no attempt can be made here even to outline the whole of the theory.

Freud was associated in his early work on the treatment of hysteria with Joseph Breuer, and in his ' History of the Psycho-analytic Movement ' he states that to Breuer should be assigned the honour of first bringing psychoanalysis into existence. Followers of Freud, however, regard this view as unduly modest. Breuer found that the symptoms of hysterical patients resulted from painful experiences, often at long-past periods of their lives. These experiences had been forgotten or ' repressed,' and by bringing them back to consciousness and allowing the appropriate emotion to manifest itself, the symptoms eventually disappeared. Breuer relied largely upon hypnosis for recalling the suppressed incidents. Freud developed for the same purpose the method termed psychoanalysis, which, by free association applied to dreams and other material, enabled the repressed ideas to be brought back to mind. He found in the process of analysing patients that many of the suppressions related to matters of sex, and in the development of this trend of thought Breuer found himself no longer able to co-operate. Pursuing his investigations alone, Freud was led to put forward a general theory as to the sexual origin of the neuroses, but his views met with bitter hostility, and for a long time he was compelled to work independently. Gradually, however, students began to come to him to learn the new methods ; Dr. C. J. Jung was at first associated with him, but later broke away to found his own school ; others among his early adherents were Professor Bleuler, Dr. Abraham, Dr. Rank, Dr. Ferenczi ; in America, Dr. Putnam, Dr. White and Dr. Brill ; and in this country, Dr. Ernest Jones.

Freud in his ' Psychopathology of Everyday Life ' has shown that the suppression into the unconscious mind of an incident or idea which is associated with painful emotion is a familiar and frequently occurring process in all of us. The little daily slips, the omission of words from letters, the ' forgetting ' of names we should be able to utter at once, are all evidences of this mechanism. A similar process to which the term ' repression ' may be given prevents certain mental processes which have never been in the conscious mind from entering therein, because they would be painful to consciousness. Such repressions relate to desires and cravings of a fundamental nature, the gratification of which, being forbidden by law, ethics, or early training, would be felt by the individual as shameful or wicked. In such a one there arises accordingly a conflict between the desires of the subconscious mind and the control exercised by the conscious mind. This conflict may be resolved by the repressed tendencies finding an outlet in another direction : for example, in a devotion to art, poetry, or religion ; which thus enables the repressed wish to be gratified and prevents it from interfering with conscious activity. This process is known as ' sublimation,' and when by its aid both the conscious and the unconscious minds are working together, the individual is capable of his greatest achievements. When sublimation fails and the forces of repression are not strong enough to exercise complete control, then some form of neurosis results. Thus, either to gratify or oppose the subconscious strivings, arise the various forms of hysteria, the groundless fears, the illogical obsessions, the sleeplessness, irritability, concentration upon self, and paralysing sense of incapacity which make up the picture of the neurotic.

It has been mentioned that the repressions which are at the base of a neurosis relate to deep-seated cravings, and it is here necessary to give some account of Freud's views on sexuality, a term which he uses with a wider significance than is usual. Freud finds the beginnings of sex life in the infant, as shown by certain tendencies, desires and actions which would not be described as sexual in the meaning given to that word when applied to adults, but which are nevertheless associated with the sex instinct and form its primitive manifestations. As the child grows, other acts and tendencies appear, indicative of desires, the details of which it would not be appropriate to discuss here, but

which will ultimately pass into the normal sex emotion, and the child goes through a more or less regular sequence of changes until full development is reached. Some of these stages would be described as perversions in an adult. When normal development occurs, the earlier stages, most of which are not directly conducive to achieving the ultimate purpose of the instinct, are satisfactorily repressed. Sometimes it happens, however, that the repressions are not effective or complete. Then arises the conflict before mentioned between the repressed desires and the inhibition laid upon them by social custom and training. According to Freud this occurrence is the fundamental factor in the etiology of a neurosis.

One other of Freud's doctrines requires brief notice, namely that relating to the origin and meaning of dreams. He maintains that every dream represents the fulfilment of a wish ; the dreams of adults being mainly a fulfilment of repressed wishes, and consequently of an egocentric character. The gratification of a repressed wish is expressed in the dream in a symbolic form, which thus prevents the true meaning from being recognised. Psychoanalysis enables the repressed or ' latent ' content of the dream to be deduced from the obvious or ' manifest ' content and the associations to which the manifest content gives rise. The discovery of the repressions reveals the psychic conflict. The interpretation of dreams is accordingly a valuable instrument in the treatment of a neurosis. Jung, on the other hand, finds in the interpretation of a dream ideals which should influence conduct.

Having now very briefly noted some of the points which have given rise to most controversy in the new psychological studies, let us see what light is thrown upon them by the experience gained in the treatment of neurotic disorders resulting from the war.

When the war broke out, the new views on the etiology of neurotic disorders were but little known in this country. Accordingly, as, after a time, men were beginning to be discharged from the army in large numbers with shattered nerves, it was supposed that the effects of high explosives had produced some condition either unknown or at all events of rare occurrence in times of peace. The term ' shell-shock ' was accordingly officially adopted to describe these cases, and various theories

were put forward to explain them ; for instance, that they were due to minute hæmorrhages in the brain or spinal cord ; or, that they were produced by poisoning by carbon monoxide generated in explosions. Further investigation, however, showed that no new disorder unknown in peace-time had arisen, and ' shell-shock ' became merely a general term, which included many varieties of neurotic disturbance.

In many cases the symptoms originated or appeared to originate from the effects of an explosion, which blew up or buried the man. In others, the symptoms came on gradually, apparently as a result of being more or less continuously under bombardment, though no actual injury or blowing up occurred. In yet others the symptoms appeared without any such exposure to risk ; sometimes indeed in men who never left England. Careful observations, such as those made by Dr. McCurdy, showed that almost always the experience of being blown up or buried, which appeared to be responsible for the condition, could only be regarded as the final precipitating cause, and that before this incident the officer or man was already suffering from nervous strain and was on the point of breaking down. The symptoms varied within wide limits, but most often they conformed to one or other of two pictures. There was the ' conversion ' hysteric, who exhibited such symptoms as paralysis of one or more limbs, or interference with a special sense, leading to deafness, blindness, loss of voice, or stammering. As a rule the mental disturbance in these cases was remarkably slight, and the man would regard a paralysed arm with equanimity, or even cheerfulness. In the other type, mental symptoms predominated. In the acute stage there was often for a time a stuporous condition, not true unconsciousness, followed by mental confusion with hallucinations of fighting. Insomnia, with terrifying dreams of bombardment, from which the sufferer awoke shrieking and bathed in sweat, was of constant occurrence, and in some cases these symptoms have persisted for years. Tremors and disturbances of gait were common. As the acute symptoms subsided and the condition became chronic, many passed into a condition of nervousness in which they were emotional, started violently at the slightest sound, and suffered from attacks of acute anxiety or mental depression. On return to civil life various phobias, such as dread of crowds or traffic, or riding on an omnibus, or going through a railway tunnel, were frequent.

Besides these two main types, many intermediate forms were seen. In addition, faulty diagnosis led to the inclusion under the term of ' shell-shock ' of a certain number of mental disturbances, which eventually proved to be the early signs of insanity, and of some cases of organic nerve disease.

The great numbers and variety of the cases discharged from the army during the war as suffering from some form of functional nerve disorder afforded unprecedented opportunities for testing various forms of treatment, and provided scope for investigation which has very materially advanced our knowledge of these affections. Indeed, it may be said that the discoveries in the treatment of the neuroses have marked an advance fully as great as any which was made in other branches of medicine or surgery during the war. The older methods of treatment, based upon the lines laid down by Dr. Weir-Mitchell, which consist essentially of complete rest with appropriate dieting, were soon found to be of no great value for the treatment of the neurotic soldier. The utility of these methods was practically restricted to a small group of cases in which the symptoms were really due to exhaustion of the nervous centres following prolonged hardship. These men were suffering from ' neurasthenia,' a term which, when used by the psychotherapist, has a strictly limited meaning, but is popularly applied to many types of functional nerve disorder. The remaining forms of treatment fell into two broad classes, viz., those which relied upon the influence of suggestion, persuasion, and re-education ; and those which were based upon psychoanalysis, or a modified form of psychoanalysis.

The treatment by suggestion (sometimes under hypnotism) often gave immediate and striking results, and in the hands of some physicians, proved of great service. The paralysed could be made to walk, the blind to see, and the deaf to hear. The method had the advantage that it demanded far less time than treatment by some form of psychoanalysis. On the other hand, the criticism was made that treatment by suggestion only cured a symptom, and that the underlying condition which had produced the symptom still persisted. Hence recurrence, or the appearance of other symptoms, was likely to take place. This proved, sometimes, to be the case. As a rule, the symptoms which had been cured did not recur, but frequently an anxiety condition replaced the paralysed limb or the loss of voice. Nevertheless,

having regard to the fact that psychoanalysis would have taken a much longer time, and that many of the patients did not possess the degree of mental development or knowledge necessary for this process, it must be admitted that suggestion was frequently the best treatment for the hysteric.

On the other hand, the treatment of the anxiety conditions by methods based upon the theory of repression, has yielded brilliant results, which fully demonstrate the value of this procedure. In a typical case suitable for this form of treatment, it will be found that the officer or man is haunted by distressing thoughts and mental pictures of mangled corpses and other horrors he has seen, which he is constantly endeavouring to banish from his mind. Any reference to his experiences fills him with anguish. Often he has been advised by well-intentioned friends resolutely to exclude all thoughts of the past, forget his terrors, and ' distract his mind ' by incessantly occupying himself with other matters. With these symptoms he suffers from battle dreams, nervousness and anxiety. Very frequently the repression has been so complete that there is a period of amnesia, *i.e.*, a period for which no conscious recollection exists. The duration of this period varies within wide limits. In extreme cases it covers the whole previous life, and instances have not been rare in which a man dates his conscious memories from finding himself in hospital in France or England, and does not know his name or recognise his wife, or is aware of such an important fact in his life as that he is married. Usually, the gap in the memory is shorter, covering a period of a few weeks or days. A man, for example, may remember going up to the trenches, and then next finding himself in the casualty clearing station, without any knowledge of what has happened to him, or how he got there. Yet the incident which had led to the collapse was perhaps several days later than his last recollection. In many cases the period forgotten or suppressed covers only a few hours or less, and there may be no apparent gap in the sequence of events, the man being unaware that he has forgotten anything. Nevertheless, while the actual incidents have gone from memory, the emotion originally aroused by the painful experiences is still present in the mind, as it were in a free-floating condition, and able to attach itself to the events of everyday life. Hence arise the continual nervousness and unreasonable fears, or phobias, to use the technical term.

The violent starting at a noise which would not disturb a normal person, for instance, has touched the subconscious memory of a bombardment.

The experience of everyone who has had to handle these cases is the same. Suppression of painful experiences is not only useless, but harmful. On the contrary, the painful incidents must be recalled to mind, boldly faced by the sufferer and examined in various aspects, until at length, though not forgotten, they cease to exercise their terrors. Where there has been no actual driving of experiences out of consciousness, but merely efforts to thrust them down, it is often sufficient for the physician to go carefully over the incidents with his patient and explain to him how these incidents and the efforts he is making to exclude them from his mind are affecting his daily life and are responsible for his symptoms. Often he can judiciously introduce a new line of thought; for example, that the ghastly state of a body was conclusive evidence that death had been instantaneous, and that the beloved comrade had felt no pain, or that the responsibility for killing his adversary did not attach to him personally, but came from much higher authority, ultimately the nation. After a few talks on these lines, often the condition rapidly improves, confidence begins to return, and perhaps for the first time the patient has a sound night's sleep unbroken by terrifying dreams.

When there has been complete suppression and a period of amnesia, short or long, is found, more searching methods must be employed for bringing the forgotten incidents back to consciousness. Sometimes the material of a dream may provide a clue from which, by association, incidents can be recovered; for example, the persistent appearance of a green patch in the battle dreams of a soldier was ultimately recognised as a patch of grass over which he had had to do sentry duty, knowing that the Germans were mining beneath him and fearing all the time that he might be blown up at any moment. Occasionally, when free association with dreams and fantasies fails, recourse may be had to hypnotism, under the influence of which the man can be made almost to live through again his terrifying experiences. The utterances and behaviour of a man going through this process is one of the most vivid and realistic things that can be witnessed. The words of command and other cries are repeated, and the

emotions of rage and terror are displayed as they actually were on the battlefield. While under the hypnotic influence, the man is told that he will, on waking, remember all the events he has apparently just been through.

The beneficial results of this process are immediate and striking. The nervousness abates and the war dreams disappear. Often it is found that after one experience has been recovered there are other and earlier experiences lying behind it which in turn have to be brought to the surface, and for complete cure it may be necessary to go back to experiences dating from before the war, sometimes right back into childhood.

The preceding paragraphs have dealt with the type of case in which war experiences appear to have been responsible, if not for the whole, at all events for the major part of the symptoms. In many cases, however, it was found that the war experiences merely gave colour to the general picture and that the repressions really responsible for the condition related to impulses of a more profound and primitive nature.

In this important respect, therefore, the treatment of war neuroses has provided striking confirmation of the early work of Freud and Breuer, namely, that painful experiences may be so deeply repressed into the unconscious as to become quite unknown to the patient, and that the bringing of these experiences to consciousness results in rapid amelioration of the symptoms. What actually is the psychic material which is repressed is still a matter of controversy. McCurdy and others with large experience of these cases adopt the view that the psychic conflict has really been one between fear and the obligation imposed by duty. When under fire, the natural impulse of self-preservation urges flight. Social training and military discipline forbid this, and the soldier is obliged to remain hour after hour in peril and to pass through indescribable horrors. At length the strain becomes intolerable, and nervous breakdown occurs, whether or not finally precipitated by an explosion. Ernest Jones, on the other hand, is not disposed to accept the attractive but rather plausible explanation, viz., that the conflict is between the so-called social 'instinct' and the 'instinct' of self-preservation. He does not consider that a neurosis can arise from a conflict between two states of mind which are fully in contact with reality. Rather he considers that the suppression is of experiences which wound

the narcissistic or self-loving part of the ego. Further discussion of this point would be too technical here, but it may be said in support of the latter view that very frequently the suppressed experiences when brought to light are found not to relate so much to incidents which excited the emotion of terror as to occurrences such as the sight of mangled corpses which aroused feelings of horror. But whatever the explanation, the fact remains undoubted that when, in the investigation of a neurotic disorder, a period of amnesia, whether short or long, is found, the lost incidents must be recovered. The application of this process to neuroses which have not arisen from the strain of battle has been found to be equally essential.

The question now arises as to how far the process of recalling war experiences alone, without further analysis, results in complete cure ; or, in other words, can it be said that a war shock can produce in a normal man a neurotic condition, the complete cure of which can be effected by recalling the suppressed incidents? To this question it is not possible yet to give a positive answer. Certainly it is the fact that in a small proportion of the cases no evidence of psychic weakness existing before the war can be found on careful investigation of the history. The symptoms appear to have been brought on solely by experiences of a terrifying or horrifying character in the field, and the removal of these impressions results in the disappearance of the symptoms. On the other hand we have the fact that vast numbers of men went through similar trying experiences without suffering from nervous disorder, which suggests that there was at least a potential liability among those who actually broke down.

Moreover, it is always a difficult thing to obtain the entire psychic history, and when, as a result of dealing with war experiences only, the symptoms had disappeared, it was not considered necessary to pursue the analysis further. Much more frequently, however, distinct evidence of psychic abnormality before joining the army was found. Many of the men stated that they had suffered from ' nervous breakdown ' on one or more previous occasions ; others described themselves as always having been highly strung, self-conscious, or excitable ; some had been abnormally shy or peculiar during childhood. It was noteworthy that the proportion of ' only sons ' was higher than that found in the general population. In these cases,

treatment of the symptoms obviously and immediately due to the war was not found to yield complete cure, and it was necessary to go back and investigate experiences in earlier life, as it were peeling off layer after layer. Again, the development of neuroses among men who were never in the line or exposed to serious danger (indeed, some of whom never left England) was a relatively common occurrence. Some of these presented all the typical symptoms of a case of ' shell-shock ' following an explosion. In practically all these cases there was definite evidence of earlier factors having influenced the mentality. In some the psychic influence of a parent was still strongly marked—the *Oedipus Complex*. In others there was clearly still present an abnormal trend in the primitive and fundamental impulses, as indicated in an earlier paragraph. Freud's views were deduced from observations of a civilian population in times of peace. His great principle—repression leading to psychic conflict—has been abundantly borne out by the experience of war ; but the relatively unimportant point as to whether his application of that principle was too limited may be regarded as still awaiting final determination.

A word of warning may be uttered here against indiscriminate and unnecessary psychoanalysis. This treatment should only be carried out by skilled physicians, and a profound analysis is only necessary and desirable where there is definite neurotic disturbance. At the present time there is distinct risk of psychoanalysis becoming to some extent a ' fashionable craze.' It cannot be emphasized too strongly that treatment by those not thoroughly versed in the subject may cause serious harm. It will be shown later that some knowledge of the principles of the new psychology is desirable for everyone, but that is not to say that a person of normal mentality should, without good reason, allow all his natural repressions to be brought to the surface by anyone who claims to be an analyst.

In view of the great advances which have been made in psychotherapy during recent years, the question arises as to how far the benefits of this treatment are or can be made available for the general public. It is now realised that, besides disorders obviously of a neurotic character, many disturbances of health seemingly due to physical causes are really manifestations of an underlying neurosis ; such, for example, as various forms of

chronic dyspepsia, debility, neuralgia, headache, etc. Many persons for whom the appropriate treatment is psychotherapy are to be found among the patients who attend the out-patient departments of the large hospitals and the consulting rooms of panel doctors. In but few cases does time permit of adequate investigation of the condition, and too often the patient only receives a fetich in the form of a bottle of medicine, from which the most that can be hoped for is that it will do some good by suggestion. Even if the mental condition which is at the bottom of the physical ailment were recognised, it would be utterly beyond the capacity of the hospitals or practitioners to give the time necessarily demanded for thorough and efficient treatment. In addition, the knowledge and technique of the treatment demands years of study, and at present only a very small proportion of the medical profession have devoted sufficient attention to the new forms of psychotherapy to familiarise themselves with its principles and practice. In these circumstances, it is likely to be a long time before the advantages of the new work are at the disposal of any more than a small fraction of the population. Probably the best means of providing treatment is by the gradual development of special out-patient clinics, and in this connection it may be useful to note the steps which have been taken by the Ministry of Pensions for the purpose of providing treatment for discharged soldiers and sailors.

When the problem presented by the shell-shocked soldier became pressing, the army authorities in 1916 and 1917 established special hospitals—both in this country and in France—for the reception of serious cases, and the experience gained in these hospitals has been of inestimable value. After the armistice, several of the larger hospitals were transferred to the Ministry of Pensions, and the excellent work they were doing has been continued. For the discharged soldier, however, the need was early felt of providing some facilities for treatment which would not involve residence in a hospital, and would, consequently, enable men who were engaged in work to be treated. Towards the end of 1917 an out-patient clinic was established in London by Sir John Collie, the first Director of Medical Services to the Ministry of Pensions, and the policy he initiated has been carried on enthusiastically by his successor, Sir Lisle Webb. The London Neurological Clinic has been enlarged again and again,

and has since its inception provided treatment for nearly 4,000 discharged soldiers and sailors. Similar clinics have been established—or are in process of being established—in many large towns throughout the country. The difficulty of obtaining a sufficient number of medical officers familiar with the new developments in psychotherapy is being overcome by providing courses of training in some of the large special hospitals for medical men who are interested in, and already have some knowledge of, the subject. The provision of clinics has enabled the accommodation in the special hospitals to be reserved for cases with a high degree of disablement or complicated by other disorders.

The results of treatment at the clinics have been exceedingly gratifying, and in no other way could adequate treatment for the large numbers have been provided. It has long been recognised that in nearly all forms of neurotic disorder it is important that the patient should be occupied or engaged in work, not for the reason so often given that it distracts his mind, but more for the purpose of encouraging his self-confidence and preventing him from feeling that he is a helpless invalid. The majority of the patients under treatment at the clinics are at work, and attend once or twice a week for treatment. In some cases, evening sessions have been established to meet the needs of those unable to leave their work during the day. Care has been taken to ensure that ample time is allowed for each case, and in a session of two and a half hours the physician is not expected to see on the average more than five patients. The expense of this treatment is necessarily considerable, but statistical investigations have shewn conclusively that the expenditure is wise, and that the saving on compensation for disablement alone has far more than paid for the cost of treatment, without considering the vastly more important fact of restoring to health and efficiency men who would otherwise have been heavily handicapped for an indefinite period in the struggle of life. Another advantage of the clinic system is found in the opportunities it affords for interchange of knowledge and experience. In the larger clinics a considerable medical staff is employed, and the physicians are able to consult with one another on difficult cases and compare different forms of treatment. Thus, new additions are continually being made to our knowledge of psychotherapy. In London the Psycho-Neurological Society

has been formed in connection with the Neurological Clinic, for the study and discussion of problems in psychotherapy.

As far as the ordinary civilian population is concerned, very few facilities for this treatment are available for those who are unable to pay the fees of consultants. One or two clinics have been started on a small scale, but it is now recognised that to cover the ground adequately very large provision of this nature will require to be made, and it is to be hoped that such clinics will eventually be established under the Ministry of Health. Their scope, however, must necessarily be somewhat greater than that of the institutions under the Ministry of Pensions, which only take cases already diagnosed and found suitable for psychotherapy. Clinics for the ordinary civilian population must be prepared to deal with all forms of mental disorder, including those which might eventually prove to be the early stages of insanity. The differentiation of incipient insanity from purely neurotic disorders is frequently difficult, and can only be made after prolonged observation and treatment. The opportunities for such observation and investigation are very seriously inadequate and their insufficiency has long been a serious reproach to psychiatry in England. The Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland has frequently called attention to the need for increased provision of treatment, and has urged the establishment of clinics to meet the want. In large centres of population the clinics should be affiliated to the general hospitals, and in smaller towns they should be linked up with a central organisation. It is in the early stages of mental disorder that the greatest opportunity for effecting cure or preventing further progress of the malady arises, but in present circumstances it is not until the condition has become certifiable that the State steps in and provides accommodation and such treatment as is possible in lunatic asylums. It is reasonable to hope that the provision of treatment under a scheme which would not inflict the stigma of insanity upon the patient would lead many to seek medical advice who are at present deterred from this course by fear of possible consequences ; while the opportunities for thorough investigation would prevent mistakes in diagnosis being made, and would indicate the most hopeful line of treatment.

Mention must be made here of the valuable foundation at Denmark Hill, which was established with the aid of a gift of

£30,000 from the late Dr. Henry Maudsley in 1908. The object of this far-sighted and generous donor was to provide a hospital for mental diseases, and not an asylum. It was intended that only cases should be admitted in which the prognosis was hopeful, either because they were in the early stage or because the type of the disorder was one which seemed amenable to treatment. Further, the institution was to undertake pathological investigations, and to provide a centre for the training and education of medical students and practitioners. These objects were to a considerable extent realised, but during the war Maudsley Neurological Hospital, as it is now termed in memory of its founder, was lent to the army, and some degree of interference with its special work was unavoidable, although as far as possible it was used for purposes consistent with the objects of its founder. The institution has now, however, reverted to its pre-war administration, and its useful work will be continued under the guidance of Sir Frederick Mott. The results of treatment of early cases of mental disorder at Maudsley are being, and will be, watched with great interest, and it is possible that the experiences gained may eventually lead to the establishment of other such institutions and to considerable modifications in our present methods of dealing with the insane.

Besides their primary function of providing opportunities for skilled diagnosis and treatment of nervous disorders, the clinics should also serve as training centres for medical students and as institutions for post-graduate study. These are essential features, for it is certain that for a long time to come the greatest difficulty in establishing clinics will be the lack of a sufficient number of medical men trained in the principles of the new psychotherapy. At present some of the larger hospitals have provided courses of lectures in this subject, and the establishment during recent years at some of the Universities of a diploma in psychological medicine has encouraged medical men to devote more attention to this branch. These efforts are, however, sporadic and incoordinated. The establishment of a well-endowed central school for the teaching of psychotherapy, which should be closely associated with a clinic, is accordingly much to be desired, and any philanthropist who is looking for an opportunity for displaying public-mindedness might well turn his attention to this need as the object of his benevolence.

Another sphere in which the new knowledge will have important effects is that of education. Already the methods are being applied with gratifying success to the delinquent, the backward, and the abnormal child. In the schoolroom, the teacher with knowledge of mental processes will better appreciate many of the difficulties his pupils encounter, will understand the significance of mistakes or wayward conduct, and will be able to utilise psychological principles in bringing about that full development of character which should be the ultimate aim of education.

Prevention of aberrant mental development is, however, the ideal to be aimed at, and for this purpose we must go back anterior to the school-days, for if the early environment has been faulty the child will already have suffered when he reaches the school-room. It is established that the seeds of a large proportion of neurotic disorders are sown in early childhood. During the first three or four years of life, the factor of paramount importance for future development is the influence of the parents. In many, and often unsuspected ways their conduct has effects upon the child which may play an important part in his whole subsequent life. In the light of the new knowledge parental responsibility becomes almost appalling, and parents who wish to do their best for their children should realise how far-reaching may be the effects of their actions and demeanour.

At birth the mind of the child is a blank. During the first few months of life, it is only conscious of its primitive needs—hunger, warmth, etc.—and it soon finds that these can be more or less satisfied by crying. At first the child does not differentiate itself from the external world. It has no knowledge of the limits of its own body, and will, for example, seize its foot and endeavour to place it in its mouth. It is simply an aggregation of autonomously acting segments, each devoted to some physiological necessity such as digestion, respiration, or excretion. Gradually, however, it becomes aware of the external world and discovers that it can partially influence the external world in its own immediate interests. Still later it becomes able to recognise and differentiate persons in its environment. During the earliest years it inevitably follows that the personalities of the parents occupy a very large part of the infant's universe. It is to the mother it turns for the satisfaction of hunger and other needs.

The identification of the father probably occurs a little later. The control exercised by the parents seems to the childish mind unlimited. They inflict punishment or give reward; they are constantly opposing the natural tendencies of the infant to gratify its fundamental needs immediately, irrespective of time, place, or circumstances. There is no doubt that the first three or four years of early life, during which the child is being taught to restrain its selfish and anti-social tendencies, constitute a period of painful conflict, the conflict between primitive impulses and the dictates of civilisation. It is the continual repression of painful experiences which leads to the complete forgetting of the early years of life in the great majority of human beings. With the development of the ego, the emotion of love is first exhibited towards the mother, and in quite early years there may be signs of jealousy of the father.

It would be out of place here to examine further the details of the influence of the parents on the child, the present purpose being merely to indicate how profound and far-reaching is that influence. Traces of the 'mother' or 'father' complex may be found in almost all of us, and in many social customs, traditions, and beliefs. The term 'Father' is applied to the deity as connoting reverence and submission to authority. The poet speaks of 'mother earth.' Few who examine themselves critically and conscientiously will fail to find beliefs, prejudices or habits, dating from parental influence in early life. If the development is normal the parental influence is shaken off as the child becomes increasingly able to protect himself. Independence of judgment and action should appear, and these manifestations should be encouraged within due limits by the parents. Sometimes, however, this breaking away does not occur, and the mother or father complex persists to such an extent when adult life is reached as to interfere with social efficiency and lead to neurotic disturbance. The child continues to lean upon the parents' judgment and help in all directions; his opinions are not his own but those of the parent who has influenced him; and subconsciously he tries in every way to retain the relationship of the early years. Such a one, when he grows up, is to a large extent psychically still a child. He avoids responsibility, and his want of self-confidence continually hinders him in the struggle of life. If he marries he is apt to select as his wife a woman who,

in some respect, resembles his mother, and is probably considerably older than himself. After marriage, unless the wife accepts this role and continually ' mothers ' him, unhappiness will follow because she does not conform to his subconscious ideal. An early jealousy of the father in a boy may show itself later in life as hatred of the father, and in a girl a subconscious love of the father may be compensated for by an intense hatred in consciousness.

The danger of parental influence persisting to such an extent as to cripple the mentality is greatest when there is only one child in the family ; or when, for some reason, such as ill health, one child receives special care and attention. For, in these circumstances, the child has the whole or the larger part of the parents' love and concern, and the struggle with brothers and sisters, which undoubtedly helps largely the normal liberating process, does not occur.

These teachings emphasise the importance of encouraging independence of thought and action in children. Too often parents never appreciate that their children are growing up, they insist upon obedience, keep them in leading strings, and check with silly or untrue answers their growing curiosity and desire for knowledge, with the result that a child's self-confidence is injured as soon as it appears. The naughty or unruly boy may have to be checked, but anything in the nature of attempting to ' break his spirit ' is disastrous. The good boy who never gives any trouble is not usually the one who is heard of in after life.

In one important respect the new knowledge renders valuable help in dealing with an old problem, namely that of sex education. It was formerly held that until the age of puberty, ideas pertaining to sex played an unimportant part in the mind of the child ; but, as Freud has shown, sex tendencies appear at a very early age and go through various developments. Without particularising further, it is sufficient to say that the mind of the child is much more occupied by ideas of this and kindred nature than is generally supposed. If parents were aware of the sequence of changes they would be able to help their children over many serious difficulties and prevent abnormal developments occurring. As soon as a child begins to make enquiries as to the mysteries of birth and reproduction, it is an indication that his mind is interested in the subject, and it is futile to endeavour to set his

difficulties at rest with fables. Children have a far more acute perception than is generally realised, and soon see through the falsity of any story that is told them. The result is that they become aware that there is some mystery, upon which they ponder, and they recognise that for some reason they are being deceived. To encourage independence of thought, the child should not be put off with any flimsy story, but should be shown that confidence and trust are reposed in him. Among boys much harm is done by parents and teachers in stigmatising certain tendencies and actions as vicious and shameful. It is now recognised that these tendencies form one of the natural stages on the way up to full sexual development. The physical harm is probably immaterial ; the psychic harm which may result from creating a feeling of guiltiness and inferiority in the boy, or dread of consequences, may be great and lead to life-long disaster.

The teaching of the new psychology brings a personal lesson to everyone. Just as there are few who do not bear in their bodies some physical defect or deviation from the normal which may be traced to influences in early life, so are there few who have come unscathed through the numerous perils which attend psychic growth. A knowledge of the subconscious mental processes enables everyone to study himself, and better equips him to overcome many of the minor troubles of life. Without the aid of a physician it becomes often possible to track the demons of irritability, depression and despair to their fundamental lurking places, and there finally destroy them. Self-analysis provides rules of conduct in life, and to those who have the courage offers a self-revelation which will enable them to see in themselves the source of their miseries, which too often they are attributing to the outside world.

It is too early yet to measure fully the value of the new investigations or to appraise the position which Freud will ultimately hold. Many who have had opportunities of seeing the applications of this work and of testing its effects are satisfied that the discoveries mark one of the greatest steps forward which has ever been taken in the study of the human mind. The revelation of the subconscious has opened up a large and hitherto almost unknown territory. Much remains yet to be learnt. Many of the views now put forward will be modified or superseded,

but the truth of the fundamental principles will remain; for, unlike those of most other branches of psychology, they can be tested and have stood the test. The layman must perforce accept this from the physician, for it is the physician alone who is in a position to apply the crucial tests. This has been done, and the proof offered of the work is the fact that its application to many suffering from mental disorders which made life a burden, has resulted in restoration to vigour and happiness.

William A. Brend.

A GREAT GERMAN CHEMIST

IN the confusion of clearing up the material and moral debris of war, the death of Emil Fischer in July, 1919, occurred unremarked in this country excepting by members of the profession which he so richly adorned. The place occupied by him in the estimation of his fellow-countrymen however, and the influence which he thereby exerted upon the chemical industry during the period in which it was reaching the vast proportions now attained, are factors of such importance to the future prosperity of the British Empire, that they demand the close attention of all Englishmen who claim to have the welfare of their country at heart. For they emphasise, in the clearest possible manner, the fundamental difference between England and Germany in the attitude hitherto adopted towards chemistry by the inhabitants, the industrialists and the governments of the two countries.

Although Fischer was one of Germany's greatest men, it is probable that, outside the scientific community, not more than one hundred of our population have ever heard of him. Nevertheless, he merits the attentive consideration of our public in equal measure with Hindenburg, Ludendorff, Tirpitz, Bethmann-Hollweg or Thyssen ; but such a statement would be misleading if unqualified by the explanation that his character was antipodal to those of the foregoing figures. Territorially a Prussian, Fischer was not a Hun. In fact, had he lived in England, he would have been regarded as an excellent Englishman, his only drawback from our conventional standpoint being phenomenal industry. It may not be inappropriate, therefore, to sketch his career in the barest outline prior to indicating the object-lesson which that career presents to us.

Emil Fischer was born on October 9th, 1852, at Euskirchen, some twenty-five miles south-west of Cologne. The only son of a prosperous and enterprising general merchant engaged in supplying the requirements of the peasant-farmers inhabiting the Eifel, he seemed predestined for a business calling, and was at first apprenticed to his brother-in-law, a timber merchant.

Developing a taste for experimental science, and cultivating it in a home-made laboratory, he threw over commerce for chemistry, qualified as a university teacher under von Baeyer, and after occupying the chairs of chemistry at Erlangen and Würzburg succeeded von Hofmann in 1892 as professor and director of the chemical institute in the University of Berlin, there fulfilling his duties with increasing distinction until his death in July, 1919.

It would be a profound mistake to imagine, from the foregoing synopsis, that Fischer was just an ordinary German professor, in league with junkers and militarists to instil the poisonous doctrine of 'Deutschland über Alles' into the undefiled veins of Teutonic youth. He was not one of the notorious 'ninety-three.' These pages are not the place in which to dwell on the unrivalled results of his chemical investigations, which are familiar to British chemists and are much too specialised for digestion by the general reader. Comment on these may be confined to the statement that he clarified and enriched our knowledge of carbohydrates, purines and proteins; that he threw new light on the action of enzymes, and regularised the experimental application of these mysterious agents in such a manner as to elevate biochemistry to the dignity of a distinct scientific branch of study. The layman must be satisfied that, when he takes breakfast, he himself becomes a practical organic chemist, and sets in motion a series of chemical operations by which the porridge, bacon, coffee, marmalade and milk will be transformed by him into body-tissues, and that it is Fischer who has contributed more than any one man to a comprehension, by chemists, of the marvellous changes involved.

Like a good citizen of any other country, Fischer loved his own, and he lost two of his three sons during the war; but he loved his work, and he allowed nothing to come in the way of that. He sacrificed health and leisure for it, and whilst at heart a joyous Rhinelander, his most familiar demeanour was one of severity, so centred was his mind in the pursuit of chemistry. Although handsome in person, distinguished in bearing, agreeable and alert in conversation, with ample means to enjoy recreation, he avoided social distraction, detested the grosser forms of publicity, and observed a modest and abstemious manner of living. From boyhood he was a pronounced individualist.

That overworked shibboleth, 'organisation,' left him cold. Personalities appealed to him; these he studied, and when they rang true, these he trusted. He knew the value of learning, but he knew it to be less valuable than wisdom, and his countrymen were wise enough to use the wisdom with which he was endowed in such full measure.

The first point to which attention should now be directed is the fact that in 1883, the chairman of the Badische factory offered him the post of director of research at a salary of £5,000. In that year Fischer was thirty-one, and had occupied his first ordinary chair of chemistry for one year only. In that year, in Germany, a salary of £5,000 would correspond to at least £20,000 per annum in England to-day. Is it possible to imagine a British board of directors daring to offer an academic chemist £20,000 per annum in a similar post? Even if they had the courage, they would probably be called upon to face an action at law to restrain them from squandering the shareholders' money. The next point is that he refused it. Why? He had already established agreeable personal relations with the directors, he was quite in sympathy with factory operations and, what was most important to him, he knew that if he accepted the position, there would be provided for him assistants, laboratories and appliances in quality and quantity unapproached by any which a university could offer. For the research department of a first-rate German chemical factory, like the Badische, is in itself an industrial university.

His refusal of this dazzling proposal must be regarded as an apotheosis of chemical investigation for its own sake. Had he accepted the directorship, he would have felt himself in honour bound to devote all his energy to the branches of chemistry with which the factory was mainly concerned. Wide and fascinating as these were, rich in chemical and monetary potentialities as they promised to be, they did not include the particular type of inquiry which he had begun to pursue, and in which he now expected to find the most ample stimulus for his mental resources. Moreover, he would know that the academic field presented, in his own country, a security of reward and recognition adequate to all reasonable requirements of a successful investigator, enabling him also to preserve that independence of intellectual outlook which his nature demanded. Thus the decision was

made and although, at the time, it may have appeared to his friends a shortsighted one, it was justified by events. It is naturally impossible to determine the developments in the colour-industry for which he might have been responsible had he gone to Ludwigshafen, but it can be argued that he accomplished more for the chemical industry by remaining in Erlangen. The course of this argument must now be traced, providing, as it does, so much that is worthy of emulation in this country.

Years before he was called to Berlin, Fischer's reputation as an investigator had grown magnetic, and increasing numbers of *doctorandi* sought admission to his laboratory. The German system of undergraduate study differs in many respects from our own, and one of the most important is the practice of passing from one university to another, and of remaining for the longest period of the 'Wanderjahre' in the one at which a thesis for the doctorate is prepared. Such a thesis describes an original investigation conducted by the candidate under the guidance of a professor, whence it happens that a student or his parents will select a university on account of the reputation of professors in the faculty to which he is attached; whereas in this country, until recently—and even now in most cases—a university is selected for geographical, social, or financial reasons, irrespective of the teachers under whom the student will place himself. Thus, in Germany, a teacher of the standing which had then been reached by Fischer would be limited in the number of his collaborators only by the laboratory capacity of the university in which he taught.

During more than thirty years, consequently, there poured from Fischer's laboratories to the factories a steady and increasing stream of young chemists. Although inevitably differing widely in natural capacity, these young chemists would be alike in admiration for Fischer, enthusiasm for chemistry and reliance on the methods of systematic inquiry; methods which, in his hands, they had seen transformed into new and living truths. Thus their contact with the basic principles upon which is founded every important industry of the civilised world was real and intimate. Herein lies Emil Fischer's greatest and most direct contribution to technology, and this is one of the most important lessons which we can learn from his life because it carries with it

the complementary circumstance that these young chemists were able quickly to find useful and congenial employment. It is from such men that the research-staffs of the Badische, Bayer, Höchst, Cassella, Merck and Berlin-Aniline factories, and twenty others, have been recruited ; research-staffs numbering from 20 to 250, according to the size of the factory. These are the factories which, since the discovery of the first aniline dye in this country, have so developed the field as to have held, in 1914, a practical monopoly of synthetic dye and drug manufacture, and which will assuredly re-assume that monopoly unless the lessons which cluster round Fischer's life are learned by Great Britain and the United States. These are the factories which, in 1914, were able to attune their vast engineering and chemical resources to the requirements of war, producing picric acid, T.N.T., chlorine, phosgene, mustard-gas and all the other poison-gases ; and which will assuredly and rapidly make a similar transformation of output in the dread event of another war.

It was one of these factories which, under stress of war, developed so completely the manufacture of nitric acid from atmospheric nitrogen as to enable Germany to snap her fingers at the blockade, so far as Chile saltpetre is concerned. Had this development not been accomplished, *Germany could not have continued the war beyond the middle of* 1915. Whilst nitric acid is vital to artillery warfare, it is necessary also for peace requirements. The only source, other than air, is Chile saltpetre, and a day may come when the deposits have so dwindled as to render its application to agriculture uneconomic. The country which has not by that time established its air-nitric acid industry will be compelled to buy nitric acid from those which have, and may, in case of war, find the vendors in a hostile camp.

The position of influence which Fischer occupied amongst the great men of Germany is well illustrated by the part he played in the establishment of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut fur Chemie, a foundation without counterpart in this country. It has been claimed, and rightly claimed, that the amazing development of chemical technology by modern Germany springs from the intimate association of instruction and research prevailing in the universities. Through this, the prospective technologist is brought in contact with the mechanism of discovery. Whilst learning the principles laid down by his predecessors, he cannot

qualify for his professional career until he has himself presided over the birth of new facts. Intrinsically unimportant as these facts may be, the mental training he thereby gains is invaluable, for it teaches him that science is living, and therefore growing ; it inspires him with the hope that, as he lives and grows, he too may enrol his name amongst the discoverers, and thus acquire his own modest share of immortality. The increasing number however of such aspirants to usefulness, stimulated by the growing demands of so many flourishing chemical industries, had, before the close of the last century, overtaxed the teaching resources of the universities, and professors began to find themselves unable to pursue many of the more complex chemical problems awaiting solution.

Recognising the dangers of this development, Fischer, in association with two other academic chemists, by sound propaganda coupled with tactful exercise of personal influence, substantially interested the chemical industrial magnates in the idea of establishing a research-foundation independent of teaching duties. After preliminaries extending through several years, the formal opening of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Chemie took place in the presence of the German Emperor on October 23rd, 1912. The Prussian Treasury had allocated an excellent site at Dahlem, Berlin, and thereon, by means of the fund to which the factories had so amply subscribed, there had been constructed laboratories with generous provision for the prosecution of scientific inquiry, untrammelled by the demands of instructional courses or of technical results. The address delivered by the Emperor on this occasion emphasised the paramount importance of chemistry to the State, and greeted the foundation of the institute as evidence of proper co-operation between the State and private enterprise in support and development of scientific investigation.

It will be readily understood that, even with his diligence and genius, Fischer could not have attained in the public mind an eminence so lofty had there not already existed in Germany an ' atmosphere,' and some attention must now be paid to this indispensable environment for the recognition of greatness. How was it possible for a man of the study and the laboratory, shrinking as he did from ceremonial, and grudging each hour torn from chemistry, how was it possible for such a man to leave

his impress on the public mind ? It was possible because the German public are conscious of chemistry. In this country the public have always confused chemistry with drug-selling, and a chemist is legally disentitled to his name. He may be styled an analytical chemist, or a professional chemist, a research chemist, or any adjective chemist, and even then he must explain himself, or he may share the experience of the professor who was commiserated by a prospective aunt-in-law on being a chemist because ' the Stores must interfere so much with the business ' now-a-days.'

Street-educated from childhood in this heresy, unenlightened at school by scientific studies, our own public are scarcely blameworthy for this absurd position. France, Germany, Italy and all the other countries outside the British Empire have one word for chemist and another word for pharmacist. It consequently happens that in those countries such verbal abominations as ' cash chemist,' ' family chemist ' and ' continental chemist ' have no significance, they are merely fatuous. Directing attention to this anomaly does not involve any reflection on pharmacists as citizens or on pharmacy as a calling. The training demanded of a pharmacist is protracted and sound ; as a body pharmacists have won the confidence and esteem of the public, but excepting a few isolated examples they are not chemists in the modern sense, because their principal pursuit is not the study of chemistry and the acquisition of new chemical knowledge. The unfortunate assumption of a misleading nomenclature has clouded the public mind. Thus a Victorian parent, discovering a taste for chemistry in his boy, believing him to have wider capabilities than those demanded by retail pharmacy, and perhaps also suffering from the Victorian snobbery aroused by shopkeeping, will have gently but firmly diverted the youthful interests into another channel. Fischer's father was free from such prejudice. When his boy rejected the opportunity to become frankly commercial, he tried to commercialise his chemical tastes, witnessing almost at his door a most promising example of the lucrative prospects offered by applied chemistry ; for even in 1871 the golden future of the Rhenish chemical factories had begun to blossom.

The discussion is thus led to the attitude of industrialists towards chemistry, and here another fundamental difference

reveals itself on comparing Great Britain with Germany. It is true that the manufacture of heavy chemicals has always flourished in this country, although in passing it is noteworthy that the alkali industry owes much to Mond, a German, and from the commercial standpoint to Brunner, a Swiss, whilst the modern process for sulphuric acid manufacture was established here by Messel, a German. Moreover, these industries, although requiring chemical control and untiring examination of new chemical processes, depend for success very largely upon those economies in large-scale production which arise from skilful engineering, shrewd purchase of raw materials and prudent disposal of the finished products. Whilst all these factors are operative also in the fine chemical, dye and drug industries, they are enormously complicated by the variety and complexity of the materials and chemical changes involved. For these industries are based upon organic chemistry, that branch of science which deals with the properties, structure and transformations of carbon compounds. The statement that organic chemists have accumulated upwards of 250,000 individual organic compounds, and that the number is growing larger each day, may serve to emphasise this point. Even the small percentage of this aggregate which is actually brought into the industries mentioned amounts to an imposing array of chemical entities, and these are the fruit of ceaseless and patient research practised by hundreds of chemists during the past 60 or 70 years, such chemists as Fischer produced and to whom he offered an example of kindling inspiration.

The difficulty in finding such chemists from among his countrymen was one of the circumstances which led Perkin, in 1874, to retire from the dye-making industry which he had founded on his discovery of mauve in 1856. Perkin himself was a faithful student of his chosen subject : he loved his laboratory and had no taste for the market. By the year mentioned he had, with the assistance of his brother, a good man of business, accumulated amply sufficient for his requirements, and when a situation arose which demanded considerable accession of capital in order to keep pace with German progress, he hesitated to risk the means he had acquired for pursuing his purely scientific studies. Moreover, he recognised that the dye-making industry was just organic chemical research on a large scale, and that it

could be developed only by profuse employment of organic chemists. The German manufacturers knew this also, and acted on the knowledge, having at their disposal the human material then beginning to proceed in a steady stream from the universities. Perkin did not find such material in existence. At Oxford and Cambridge there was no school of chemistry in the German sense ; only during the last ten years has due attention been paid to the subject in those seats of learning.

The Emil Fischer of that period was A. W. von Hofmann, whose career illustrates one of the many blunders which have marred the dismal history of British coal-tar dye-manufacture. A glimpse at this disaster must now be taken. It cannot be claimed that the nation which produced Priestley, Cavendish, Dalton, Davy, Faraday and Perkin is barren in chemists, but in 1842 this country was lamentably deficient in laboratories for training chemists. Those in existence presented the subject as merely ancillary to other professions, medicine, engineering or law. In the year mentioned, Liebig, one of the first organic chemists and already famous as an investigator and teacher, made an apostolic tour of this country, visiting in their homes the Prime Minister and several of the great agriculturalists of that period. Meetings were held in many towns to which Liebig explained the importance of chemistry to mankind. By the enterprise of the Prince Consort and Sir James Clark, the Royal College of Chemistry was founded in 1845, modelled on the Liebig School at Giessen, which had attracted students from all parts of the world. Hofmann was appointed director, and the first two sessions, conducted in temporary premises, gave ample justification for the venture ; the permanent building in Oxford Street was then opened under the happiest auspices, and an increasing number of students embraced the opportunity of pursuing their chosen subject under a teacher so stimulating, and an investigator so fruitful, as Hofmann. During the succeeding years he completed, concurrently with his instructional duties, a variety of researches, amongst which his discoveries in the class of aniline products have become classical. In fact, it is not too much to say that the beginnings of the coal-tar colour industry, as a systematised organism, owe most to Hofmann, with Perkin and Nicholson, his two distinguished pupils.

The support which was given to the Royal College of

Chemistry in its early days and which arose largely from the agricultural aspect of Liebig's mission, did not keep pace with the requirements of the College; absorption by the School of Mines took place, and rather than lose his freedom of action, Hofmann returned to Bonn in 1864, proceeding to Berlin in the following year. During the next twenty-seven years he there trained and stimulated a notable regiment in that army of research chemists which carried the German dye-making industry to 'Weltmacht.' He died in 1892, and this generation has witnessed the power and influence of his immediate successor, Emil Fischer.

It is not difficult to imagine the demands which were made upon Fischer's energy and wisdom during the five years destined to be the closing period of his life. Both temperament and age confined his activities to the 'home front.' In the scanty leisure which, throughout life, he had allowed himself, Fischer acquired a knowledge of French literature which became the source of respect for the French national genius, and he was entirely free from the Prussian illusion that the destruction of France would be a relatively simple affair. Although a good German, as he was entitled to be, he exerted himself to ameliorate the condition of prisoners in Germany, irrespective of nationality. His chemical activity during the war period was incessant, but it did not relate to the branch of chemical warfare which rightly earned such detestation in this country; its main object was the utilisation of such food resources as Germany possessed in a manner calculated to counteract the worst effects of the blockade.

In January, 1917, he urged upon the War Ministry the need for a foodstuffs-commission to stimulate production on behalf of men and animals. Heroic as the efforts of the German army continued to be, prodigious as were the sacrifices made by the German people, he emphasised with increasing earnestness the subordinate position occupied by heroism and sacrifice in relation to physiological law, disobedience to which must inevitably be followed by psychological deterioration. The possibilities of straw, wood, leaves, rushes and every kind of despised vegetable produce were explored from this standpoint, but he foresaw the results of increased disease, diminished capacity for work and impaired moral resistance arising from protracted under-nourishment. Broken-hearted, he returned to his purely

scientific studies at the armistice, and in the closing weeks of 1918 he witnessed, in the establishment of the 'Deutsche Gesellschaft zur Förderung des Chemischen Unterrichts,' the launch of an enterprise very near to his heart. During the war he had become gravely concerned at the diversion of young chemists to its requirements, and the consequent injury to the scientific spirit of the new generation. With the purpose of meeting this danger, and at the same time relieving the embarrassment to teaching institutions occasioned by the diminished value of money, he raised a substantial fund constituting, in his own words, 'der letzte Dienst den ich der 'deutschen Wissenschaft leisten kann.'

Such was Fischer's life, simple, straightforward and honourable. The warning which that life conveys to England lies in an honest answer to the question, 'Could such a life have been lived in this country, and have been allowed to bear such abundant fruit?' The unquestionable answer being 'No,' it is equally unquestionable that, unless the attitude of the inhabitants, industrialists and government of this country towards chemistry, particularly organic chemistry, so changes as to make it possible for a potential Emil Fischer to develop his powers for the public benefit as outlined above, the paramount position of Germany in this field must surely re-assert itself, just as precisely and inevitably as the sequence of day and night.

M. O. Forster.

CAPITALISM

II.

IN the previous article* the meaning of the word Capitalism was examined, and the conclusion was reached that, as commonly used in a polemical sense, it means a particular mode of using material and financial capital characterised by the following conditions :—(1) private ownership ; (2) production for profit ; (3) by means of hired labour, so as (4) to procure for the owner an income without work. In Marxian economics that only is capital which is used in this way. It was further shown that all these conditions existed in ancient societies and in the Middle Ages, and that the teaching which assigns the origin of Capitalism to the sixteenth century or any such date is historically erroneous.

The importance of this lies in its bearing on the Marxian theory of historical evolution, with which the doctrine of class warfare is bound up. The theory postulates a succession of distinct social systems, determined by economic conditions ; each having a definite beginning, rise and fall, brought about through the class-war engendered within itself by the antagonism of economic interests. Capital, which has produced the present or capitalist system, is thus regarded as an historical category ; and the theory requires that it should be marked off sharply from the antecedent system by radical economic differences. That is to say, the process of producing wealth must be shown to be of a new and essentially different character, based on new principles and leading to a new form of class-war. If the historical data are unsound the bottom falls out of the theory. Hence the stress laid on the origin of Capitalism as posterior to feudalism, and on its distinguishing marks. It is frequently asserted, for instance, that before the sixteenth century industrial capital did not exist, that production was solely for use, not profit ; that goods were exchanged for goods, and money was practically unknown ; that there was no competition ; that the craftsman had no wage labourer to exploit—and so forth. In short, recourse

* Edinburgh Review, July, 1920.

is had to audacious misstatements of fact in order to emphasize the severance of the new economic principle from the old. To blacken the new a halo is thrown round the old, and history is falsified to furnish the gilding.*

The real difference in economic conditions between the past and the present does not lie in the principle or the intrinsic nature and function of capital. It lies in the development of the economic apparatus and in environmental changes, physical and psychical, acting and re-acting upon it. Capitalism unquestionably occupies a different place in the world to-day from that which it has held in the past. From small and local operations it has expanded to national and international spheres of action ; its prevalence is world-wide. This development implies changes in scope, size and complexity, in means and organization. And the world has changed too. Wealth and population have increased, and with them the economic factor in life has risen in importance ; it takes precedence of mental and spiritual activities, which were formerly held of more account, but are now subservient to it. Its ascendancy in the present plutological age has led to the superficial theory that it has always been equally dominant and has determined all the other social activities which go to make up history. According to this theory changes in economic conditions precede and determine all other changes, and consequently the differences just indicated between the present and the past are ascribed to a new economic principle, called Capitalism, which made its appearance in the sixteenth century. But, as has already been said, an examination of the historical facts shows that what was new was not the principle but the scale of operations.

Marx himself admits this. He says that at first the difference was purely quantitative, and that the workshop of the medieval craftsman was simply enlarged in the stage of manufacture that immediately followed it. More men were employed, but the extraction of surplus-value from their labour, which forms the

* For instance, Mr. Noah Ablett, one of the lights of the Labour College, says, in his ' Easy Outlines of Economics,' that in the fourteenth century ' wage-labour was not dreamt of.' Then what were journeymen and their corporations ? And to whom did the Statutes of Labourers apply ? Mr. Mark Starr, also of the Labour College, teaches that the guilds owned the means of production.

capitalist's profits, was not thereby affected. And this process is the core of his theory. The surplus-value, he says, produced by a given capital is equal to the surplus value produced by each workman, multiplied by the number of workmen simultaneously employed; and 'the number of workmen in itself does not 'affect either the rate of surplus-value or the degree of exploitation 'of labour power.'

'Nevertheless, capitalist production only then really begins when each individual capital employs simultaneously a comparatively large number of workmen. . . . A greater number of workmen working together at the same time and in one place, in order to produce the same sort of commodity under the mastership of one capitalist, constitutes both historically and logically the starting-point of capitalist production.'

So here we have another condition laid down to constitute Capitalism. The number of workmen employed must be 'comparatively large.' But what is comparatively large? Where is the dividing line, and how is it determined? Is a man who starts for himself in a small way with a couple of workmen a capitalist or not? At what stage does he become one? Most new industries and new concerns are started in that way to this day. If capitalist production only then really begins when each individual capital employs a comparatively large number of workmen, then it has not really begun yet; for the small establishment has shown a vitality that completely falsifies Marx's prediction. It has not succumbed to the large, and shows no signs of succumbing; new ones are continually being started as old ones are swallowed up or themselves grow large. This counteracts the general tendency to increased size.

The most complete and recent censuses of business concerns are those for Germany, in 1907, and for the United States, in 1909—the two countries in which capitalist and industrial development was then advancing most rapidly. The German statistics include all classes of business concerns, and they give the total number of small establishments employing 1-5 persons in 1907 as 3,124,198 with an aggregate of 5,353,576 employees, or some thousands more than the large concerns employing over 50 persons each. The number of small establishments had increased by 190,000, and the number of persons employed in them by 600,000, since the previous census of 1895, which in

turn showed an advance on that of 1882. Of the total number 1,870,261 were classified as industrial and these employed 3,200,282 persons, or about 10,000 more than in 1895. It appears from these figures that the number of small establishments classified as industrial has fallen very little during the last twenty-five years, in spite of a rapid increase in the number of larger ones. In the same period the number of small commercial establishments had doubled. It is not possible to give similar comparative figures for the United States ; but in 1909, out of the total number of 268,491 'manufacturing establishments,' 136,289, or more than half, employed only from one to five wage earners. And the United States is the home, above all other countries, of large concerns and large capitals. The truth is that highly developed industries which are conducted on a great scale, constantly breed new ones on a small scale for providing parts, ' accessories ' and repairs. Similarly the large multiple shops or stores breed small ones by attracting crowds of customers, whose presence gives a beginner —generally an old member of the large staff—the chance of starting for himself in some special line. The process may be seen in any great shopping neighbourhood. In agriculture the case is still more striking, the number of small establishments having greatly increased at the expense of the large ones.

The extinction of the small employer is not yet in sight and the Marxian postulate of size as an essential condition of capitalist production must be abandoned, or it must be admitted that Capitalism is still very imperfectly developed. Marx knew so little about actual conditions, which he omitted to study by direct observation (there is no evidence that he ever entered one of those factories about which he wrote so much), and cotton mills occupied such a disproportionate space in his views of industry, that he may very well have believed the small industry extinct, or, at least, doomed to speedy extinction. But it is a serious mistake, because the inevitable downfall of Capitalism—the summary conclusion of all his economic theorizing—depends on this assumed process, which has not taken place. Marx was led into the error by abstract reasoning from arbitrary premises without checking his conclusions by the objective study of concrete facts. This is not science, but metaphysics, for science begins with observation and depends for its validity throughout on the completeness and accuracy of the observed data. Predictions

based on incomplete or inaccurate data have little chance of fulfilment; and the more logical the process by which they are reached the more certain they are to diverge from reality.

It is indeed a commonplace of socialist controversy that events have not followed the course marked out by theory. This is the origin of 'Revisionism.' The term is applied to both policy and principles. It was first used in 1895 at the annual meeting of the German Social Democratic Party at Breslau with reference to the sphere and scope of the Party. Their conceptions, said Schoenlank, had undergone a revision; they had ceased to be the party of the industrial proletariat alone, and had extended their operations to the rural population, which could not be dealt with in the old frame-work and under the old dogmas, but required new ideas and new aims. The point of this is that the Marxian argument revolves entirely round the town or factory workmen. Then 'revision' came to be applied erroneously to the policy of opportunism or reform; but in the great debate on the subject at Dresden in 1903, Bernstein, the leader of the revisionists, declared that it concerned theory, not policy, and that what needed revision was the preamble to their programme. This is the celebrated Erfurt programme of 1891. It is the most authoritative modern expression of the Marxian doctrine; and the earlier paragraphs, which Bernstein wished to revise, recapitulate the salient points of the theory. They run as follows:

'The economic development of bourgeois society leads inevitably to the ruin (Untergang) of the small industry, the basis of which is the private ownership by the workman of his means of production. It separates the workman from his means of production and turns him into a propertyless proletarian, while the means of production become the monopoly of a relatively small number of capitalists and large land-owners.

'Hand-in-hand with this monopolisation of the means of production goes the displacement of the scattered small industry by the colossal large industry, the development of the tool into the machine, and a gigantic increase in the productivity of human labour. But all the advantages of this transformation are monopolised by capitalists and landlords. For the proletariat and the sinking middle classes—small tradesmen and peasant farmers—it signifies progressively increasing insecurity of existence, misery, oppression, subjection, degradation and exploitation.

'Ever greater grows the number of proletarians, ever vaster the army of superfluous workers, ever more embittered the class-war between bourgeoisie and proletarians, which divides modern society

into two hostile camps and is the common hall-mark of all industrial countries.'

It was proposed to revise these paragraphs and two or three more because they did not correspond with the facts. Nor did the conference venture to maintain the contrary. It passed a resolution condemning reformist tactics, which is quite another matter, and declaring that class-antagonism was not relaxing, but continually hardening, which again is not the same thing. The theory of the collapse of Capitalism by an inevitable process inherent in its own development, which is the grand discovery of ' scientific socialism ' and the only really original thing in it, obviously depends on fulfilment of the conditions which make the process inevitable. The argument is thus stated by Marx himself in an oft-quoted passage. As soon as the capitalist mode of production, he says, is fully developed, the process of social change takes a new form.

' That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the workman working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many workmen. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralization of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand-in-hand with this centralization or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever extending scale, the co-operative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labour into instruments only usable in common, the economizing of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialized labour ; the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and with this the international character of the capitalist régime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation ; but, with this too, grows the revolt of the working-class—a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up along with it and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated. . . . Capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of nature, its own negation.' (' Capital,' ch. xxxii.)

All the ideas in this argument, with the exception of the last, which is of Hegelian origin, were set out by Sismondi, when Marx was in his cradle ; as, indeed, is virtually admitted in the Communist Manifesto. In 1819 Sismondi wrote (*Nouveaux Principes d'Economie Politique*) :—

' Now wealth is the fruit of labour : economy in the expense of production can be nothing but economy in the quantity of labour employed to produce, or economy in the payment of this labour. In fact, from one extremity to the other of countries in which free competition is admitted, the governing idea in whoever undertakes productive labour, or whoever pays for it, is to make more things with the same quantity of human labour, or as many things with a less quantity of human labour, or to obtain human labour at a lower price. . . . Let whatever is called progress in the arts, in manufactures, in agriculture, be examined, and it will be found that every discovery, every improvement, may be reduced to doing as much with less labour, or more with the same labour ; all progress tends also to reduce the value and reward of labour or the ease of those who live only to labour.

The fundamental change which has taken place in society amidst the universal struggle created by competition is the introduction of the proletary among human conditions, the name of which, borrowed from the Romans, is ancient, but whose existence is quite new. . . . It may almost be said that in modern times the community lives at the expense of the proletary, on that share of the remuneration of his labour which it deducts from him.'

And again :—

' The collective wealth of those nations which the economists considered as the most advanced, has in fact increased, and sometimes in a very rapid proportion ; but, at the same time, the number of rich men has diminished rather than increased, the intermediate ranks have disappeared, small proprietors, small farmers in the country, small artisans, small manufacturers, small shop-keepers in the towns, have not been able to compete with those who direct vast undertakings. There is no longer any room in society for any but the great capitalist and the man who lives on wages ; and that formerly almost imperceptible class of men who have absolutely no property has increased in an alarming manner. In fact, all working men, all those who by the labour of their hands create the wealth which is spread throughout society, have ceased to have any direct right or interest in the different works which flourish through their means. They are bound to them only by daily wages, by a contract which they and their masters renew every week. . . . Daily labour is the income of the poor ; the fruits of accumulated labour give an income to the rich. . . . The day-labourer, hired by the week, has no interest ; he brings neither intelligence nor good-will to his work.' (*Revue Mensuelle d'Economie Politique*. 1834.)

And again :—

'It is in the midst of these trades (handicrafts) exercised by the freemen of towns, which formerly did all the industrial work in all nations, that manufactories have arisen. The masters of manufactories in towns hold the same place in the industry of towns that great land-owners do in the country. Like them, to make their own great fortunes, they must cause the disappearance of one or two hundred small independent properties ; like them, they afterwards, by agreeing together, reduce all the men who work under them to a state approaching servitude ; like them, by the great means at their disposal, the employment of scientific assistance, the more complete division of labour, the economy of time and of inspection, whilst they make an advance they cause the condition of men to recede.' (*Revue Mensuelle d'Économie Politique.*)

This is precisely the Marxian argument on the evolution of modern Capitalism. Much more might be quoted from Sismondi, but the foregoing passages contain all the salient points—the displacement of the former small industries by the large ; the creation of the 'proletariat' ; capital as 'congealed' labour, its growth and concentration ; the effect of large-scale operations and technical improvements in extracting more surplus value and depressing labour—which *Das Kapital* sets out to prove by elaborating the labour theory of value. Sismondi was the first economist to offer a formal challenge to the *laissez-faire* theory of economics. He called it the science of wealth-making or *chresmatistique*, after Aristotle ; in which he is also duly followed by Marx, who quotes Aristotle to the same effect. Plutology is a better word. Sismondi's denunciation of its ill effects is more eloquent, yet better reasoned and better balanced than that of any of the numerous later writers on the same subject. He saw the thing at its height. He came to England for the purpose of studying it and was contemporary with the English pioneers of economic Socialism, William Thompson and Thomas Hodgskin, with whom he had much in common, though he was no Socialist. He had a slight priority in point of time—his *Nouveaux Principes* preceded Thompson's 'Inquiry' by five years—and he covered a wider range of thought. There is hardly a weapon in the anti-capitalist armoury to-day which he did not forge.

Sismondi anticipated Carlyle's 'cash nexus' ; Ruskin's demand for recognition of the human element ; Marx's 'proletariate' and surplus value, of which he says :—'This income (rent, interest

'profits) whether obtained in the country or the town, is never 'anything but the surplus of the value of what labour has pro- 'duced above the advances that have been made to produce it.' He pointed out the difference between the old handicraft methods and the new power manufactures, the servitude of wage-labour, production for profit instead of for use, the consequent glutting of the market, unemployment and the depression of labour, the part played by under-consumption, the workman's lack of interest in his work, his reduction to a machine, the reservation of all intelligence and direction to the heads of concerns, which is the converse of the present cry for a share in the management. He pleaded the right of the poor to share the benefits of progress, to enjoy more rest, more security, more education, more culture, more social pleasures, a higher and happier life—in short, all the things which are demanded to-day by our labour intellectuals and are recognised as just by public opinion at large.

No man of his time covered the ground so completely; nor, indeed, has any since. But that is not the reason why so much attention is drawn to him here. The point is the special bearing of his teaching on Capitalism. Sismondi founded no school, as Professor Foxwell points out; but that is one of his merits. He neither offered to lead society into a Utopia, like most of his contemporaries, nor did he profess to have discovered a scientific principle which must determine the future course of events, like Marx. He had no Hegelian bee in his bonnet, and was too accomplished an historian to entertain any such cheap interpretation of history as the economic class-war, of which Croce says, after a most penetrating but scrupulously fair examination, that 'history is a class-war when it is a class-war.' Sismondi was an observer with a love of justice and keen sympathy with all suffering and oppression, and he described the effects of the economic developments of his time that violated those sentiments. He made some mistakes, for instance, in saying that the number of rich men was diminishing, when it was, in fact, rapidly increasing. But he was fair in his account and recognised the good effects too. The ill effects of the period are a truism to-day, and undeniable, though often over-stated. Sismondi saw them at their worst. But he did not assume that they must go on increasing progressively, unless the existing order were totally abolished. Consequently he had no need to invent an ideal—and

unworkable—system to replace it or to discover an inexorable —and fallacious—law of development to justify the assumption. He rather pointed the path of removing abuses and improving conditions. In short he was one of the fathers of social reform, which is what Marx meant when he called Sismondi the head of the school of middle-class Socialism.*

Now reform is the line that events have in fact taken. The actual development of Capitalism has negatived the assumption that the tendencies indicated above and prominent in Sismondi's time would continue to assert themselves on a progressive scale. It has already been shown that the disappearance of small undertakings has not taken place, and that Capitalism has, by its own development, tended to their constant renewal. It has done more. It has led to the restoration of the independent home worker by supplying him with electrical power, while fashion has encouraged the revival of domestic handicrafts. But these later developments are but a small part of the counter-movement against the tendencies of Sismondi's time that has since set in. It is a many-sided movement, made up of several distinct currents, which react on each other. One comes from changes in the form and use of capital itself; a second from defensive combinations of wage-earners; a third from the interposition of the State, and this is of a multiform character; a fourth from capitalists and employers themselves; a fifth from the co-operative principle.

To review them all would be far beyond the scope of a single essay; nor is it necessary to dwell on some, which are sufficiently familiar. But others are so little understood or so habitually overlooked that some reference to them is required. Let us take the first, which is the least understood. Marx assumed the continuous and progressive concentration of capital, as it was then proceeding: that is to say, its accumulation in individual hands. The concentration was personal as well as economic. He always represents the capitalist—identified with the employer

* Mr. Noah Ablett (*op. cit.*) says of Sismondi that he and Boisguillebert (!) were the chief representatives of the Physiocratic school. He has evidently never read either and does not know the meaning of physiocratic. He must have got his lecture notes mixed. It is inconceivable that any responsible teacher at a labour or any other college could make so gross a blunder.

—as a very rich man. With elephantine playfulness he calls him Mr. Moneybags, and depicts him as growing richer and richer at the expense of smaller men 'by the action of the immanent 'laws of capitalistic production,' whereby 'one capitalist always 'kills many.' The necessary effect of this process is that the big capitalists grow ever bigger and fewer, while their victims grow poorer and more numerous and the 'proletariate' sinks into deeper misery and oppression. For a time this process of concentration did go on, and to a certain extent does still. But presently Capitalism evolved another form, which gradually superseded it. Dr. Renner, the eminent Austrian Socialist, who has described it very clearly, calls it the 'centralization' of capital.

Its earliest form is an arrangement between friends, by which one capitalist takes sleeping partners who share the proceeds but do not appear. This is not so modern as Dr. Renner supposes. It was known to and approved by St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century, as was shown in a previous article; and it has, no doubt, had a continuous history since. Its complete modern form, brought about by the growth and diffusion of wealth, is the limited liability company. The difference is that in this form of Capitalism there is economic concentration, but personal diffusion. That is to say, the concern is one, but the proceeds are distributed to many. Dr. Renner expresses the difference between the two forms by the formula:—Concentration is one capital = one capitalist; Centralization is one capital = many capitalists.

The development of modern finance has accompanied and facilitated the extension of the latter by gathering up all the little gains and savings of small people and putting them to use in large undertakings. Savings banks and shares have replaced the stocking, and the result is an enormous growth of small capitalists, who are found in all ranks. Persons in receipt of poor relief and nominally paupers are not infrequently found on death to be the owners of considerable sums in banks or shares. It is only necessary to attend a half-yearly meeting of one of the large railway companies to see abundant evidence of the wide social distribution of industrial capital. The shareholders receive a free pass over the line for the occasion and the small investors make a day's outing of it. The gathering consists mainly of persons in a humble rank of life, including not a few railwaymen.

Lancashire cotton operatives own a large part of the share capital in many mills, and during the coal strike of 1912 miners actually bought shares in the very mines they were striking against. During the recent by-election at Paisley, which was vigorously contested on behalf of the Labour Party, a singular reticence was observed about the vast profits of Messrs. Coats, which should have been a strong card to play. The reason was that the work-people of Paisley have extensive investments in the concern and the profits are highly popular. But France is the country where the small capitalist of this kind flourishes most, for the French are the thriftiest, as well as the most industrious, of all Western peoples. Dr. Renner says of France that there the bank-system collects from domestic servants, day-labourers, factory workers, minor officials, little land-owners, and small industrials, every particle of value that happens to be standing idle ; and 'if Russia 'goes bankrupt nearly everyone in France will rue it.' This was written in 1917, but it throws a strong light on the present international situation and the attitude of France. The bond-holders concerned about Russia, whom our Labour Press assumes to be all wealthy men, represent a large proportion of the French 'proletariate.'

Marx did not foresee these developments of Capitalism, though he recognized the banking movement ; and his orthodox disciples decline to see them because they run counter to his written word, which is to them sacred. Others, less bound by the letter of the law, do see them and maintain that the true Marxian method is to take account of facts and not to go on repeating formulas which no longer apply. At any rate the facts are there and they involve changes in class relations. The whole theory of class conflicts is, in truth, at fault. The simple conception of capitalist versus workman, or 'bourgeoisie' versus 'proletariate,' on which the whole Marxian structure is raised, never fitted the facts any more than the conception of feudal lords versus bourgeoisie, which is supposed to have preceded it, fitted medieval society. There were then many classes and their relations—alliances and conflicts—were continually changing ; and so it is now. The class-relations connected with capital are only one field of several, but even these are constantly changing with the developments of capital.

The second source of change mentioned above is the trade

union movement, which is too familiar to need any emphasis. But familiar though it is, as a fact, its significance is often misunderstood. It is regarded as representing the interests of labour against those of capital, and industrial disputes are commonly spoken of in those terms. Labour and capital are daily exhorted to make friends and not cut each other's throats. But the antagonism is only part, and not the essential part, of the situation. Labour and capital are abstractions, but conflict lies between men, and their relationship is not merely economic ; it is that of employers and employed, of directors and directed, of those who give and those who take orders. It was against employers that workmen combined and formed unions ; and though employers were generally capitalists that is not a necessary condition. This becomes evident when we observe that unions are formed by men and women employed in unproductive public services, in which the employers are not capitalists or engaged in extracting profits. In Russia under the Soviet system Capitalism has been abolished and workmen are supposed to run the factories themselves. This was tried for a short time, but proved such a total failure that it was abandoned, and directors with autocratic powers were installed. They were not capitalists, of course, but the workmen none the less combined against them and went on strike to such an extent that military force was employed against them and strikes were suppressed by shooting strike-leaders, not in accidental frays, as has happened elsewhere, but deliberately by quasi-judicial procedure. The so-called trade unions are not voluntary, self-governing bodies, but are organized by authority and run by Communists appointed by the Government, as Otto Bauer has described in his fully documented account of Bolshevism. The recourse to such extreme severity under a non-capitalist system, in order to prevent workmen from combining against their employers, shows that the economic formula—capital versus labour—very inadequately represents the relationship. Liberty is, in truth, a deeper spring of trade unionism than a larger share of the product. That is why it has evolved the form of syndicalism in recent years, and the clearer-sighted Socialists see it. Now the trade unions have become so powerful that they are securing both a larger share in the product and more liberty ; and this line of advance modifies the whole social problem.

The interposition of the State, which is the third element of change, is also both familiar and imperfectly appreciated. It is so multifarious that a volume would be needed to survey it at all fully. One prominent side of it is the progressive legislative control of industrial enterprise, which has never really enjoyed the complete freedom demanded by *laissez-faire* economy, and has submitted to gradual encroachment for many decades. This alone would be fatal to the Marxian hypothesis, which presupposes unfettered competition ; and the anti-reformist Marxians see it. Hence their opposition to the policy of reform. It puts off the catastrophic collapse of Capitalism. Factory law, gradually evolved in one country after another, and in recent years tentatively handled by international action, forms a progressive code of restrictions on free competition. Its object is to protect the weak from oppression and it began in a small way by protecting the weakest—the children and the women. It has gradually extended its scope and tightened its hold. It regulates hours of work and rates of pay and standing work-shop conditions on an ever advancing scale ; it prescribes rules for protecting workers from dangerous machinery, dust, poisons and other conditions inimical to health. This is one great field of State action ; and allied to it is interposition in industrial disputes. Another, more recent, is workmen's compensation and compulsory insurance against sickness, accident and unemployment. A third field of State action is the restriction of international competition by protective tariffs ; and a fourth is State finance, particularly as developed in Germany. Yet another, quite distinct, is the taking over of productive industries, as well as necessary services, by public authority, chiefly in the form of ' municipal trading.' To use Dr. Renner's expression, economic life is now ' State-permeated.'

The action of capitalists and employers has taken several forms, and has been partly voluntary and partly compulsory. Recognition of trade unions, which is the converse side to the workmen's combination movement, must be regarded as compulsory, for it was resisted as long as possible, and is still resisted in some countries, and occasionally even here. But, broadly, employers have now acquiesced, and joint boards of conciliation have become general. On the other hand individual employers have led the way to improved conditions, both by legislation and

by ' welfare work,' as Miss Proud has shown in her book on that subject.*

' In theory and in practice it appears that the best employers have played a fundamental part in the gradual raising of the workers' standard of life. Indeed, step by step, the path of progress has been marked out by employers, through their individual efforts made from time to time throughout the nineteenth century. . . . Welfare work has, in fact, dragged the law after it, and the law still lumbers in its wake.'

All pioneering is, in fact, done by individuals, which is the great argument for individualism.

Capitalists have also themselves partly abandoned the principle of free competition by forming combinations. This process has two very different objects, which are commonly confused. One is to regulate production and sale in such a way as to steady the market and avoid those violent oscillations which have such a disastrous effect on economic conditions. The other is to create a monopoly for the purpose of forcing higher prices on consumers than they would otherwise pay, but it is doubtful if this is ever really done, except by way of speculation, which usually fails.

As for the co-operative movement, it has as yet proceeded little beyond trading, and hardly touches the large productive industries, but so far as it goes, it tends to increase the number of small capitalists, since it rests on the principles of private ownership, hired labour and profits, though they are called by another name, and is rather a modification of Capitalism than a new economic form. Large and prolonged strikes take place within it.

All these movements and other minor ones have changed the whole problem. They negative the premise of unrestricted competition tacitly assumed by Marx and counteract the tendencies described, with truth, by Sismondi in his day, but already modified when Marx wrote a generation later. The concentration of capital has been offset by a great diffusion ; the ' proletariate ' or wage-earners have not been depressed, but raised ; the intermediate classes have not been driven down and eliminated, but have greatly increased ; economic crises have become milder instead of more severe—the mass of misery has not grown ever greater, but has perceptibly shrunk. The last statement needs

* See the EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1916.

no proof to anyone conversant with social conditions and able to compare the past with the present, but since the theory of increasing misery is still maintained in controversy, it may be as well to say that this is not a matter of opinion or of argument, but of fact, demonstrated by such massive and exact evidence as the progressive diminution of pauperism—which represents the lowest economic stratum—in an increasing population, the steadily declining general and infantile death-rates, and the rising expectation of life. These movements would be impossible in a population sinking deeper into misery.

The improvement in social conditions is not due solely to the negative influence of restrictions on free competition which have checked its worst results, but is much more to be ascribed to the positive influence of private enterprise, still left freer than in former ages. It has contributed, in the first instance, to those vital improvements just mentioned by providing an unfailing supply of cheap, varied and abundant food, sufficient to sustain a population many times greater than could be supported before free industrial and commercial activity was introduced. Then famines used to occur irregularly, but at pretty frequent intervals, and were sometimes so severe as to cause extreme hardship and even starvation on a considerable scale. Is it nothing that the haunting spectre of famine has been so completely banished that people forgot its possibility before the late war ? But the critics of Capitalism never take this into account at all. The abolition of Capitalism and the installation of an ideal economic system built on theories were at once followed by famine, even in the great food-exporting country of Russia, where previously a surplus always existed. It is attributed by defenders of Bolshevism to the ' blockade,' but that is merely an ingenious afterthought. Lenin said nothing about the blockade in his report on the subject two and a-half years ago. It was due, as he told them, to the refusal of the peasants to produce or to sell because they could not get their price. The townspeople resorted to surreptitious trading in order to keep alive, and now it is winked at by the authorities. Mrs. Sheridan has recently described the illegal market in Moscow, where Madame Trotzky is said to have been caught supplementing her lawful butter ration. Is there no lesson in this ?

Water is no less necessary to life than food, and the greatest

of all contributions to public health is the provision of a sufficient supply of clean water in towns. It has been achieved by a series of innovations all introduced by private enterprise. Water brought from a distance in pipes and laid on to houses; deep wells, pumping, filtration through sand and a constant supply under pressure—all these have been brought in by capitalistic enterprises, and only copied by public authorities when they were successful.

The same holds good of locomotion and transport by land and sea; of communication by letter, telegraph, telephony and wireless. These have been gradually established, extended and improved by the men who never produce for use—so we are told—but only for profit, as though there could be any profit if there were no use. And they have been brought within the reach of all, except, perhaps, the very latest and most expensive improvements. But these will follow. It has always been so with free enterprise. The private carriage was followed by the coach; the coach by the omnibus. Omnibus, by the way, is a true and most significant word. So the motor car has been followed by the motor bus and the charabanc. One after another the forms of power discovered by free research have been brought into the service of all by free enterprise.

Another field of the first importance is artificial light, which has been constantly improved and made accessible to all classes. So, too, have the means of domestic heating down to the gas and electric cooker.

Then there are newspapers and books, food for the mind, the masterpieces of literature brought within the reach of all. Also innumerable entertainments, amusements, games and recreation of every kind, down to the latest and most popular of all, the cinema.

All these—and many more—products of Capitalism, such as clothes, furniture, crockery, hardware and domestic fittings of every kind are marked by the varied and free choice offered. The power of choice is a factor of the first psychological importance, but never thought of until it is taken away, as in the stress of war. It is sometimes argued that under Capitalism consumers have to take whatever producers choose to give them. The argument is both untrue and illogical. The ground on which *laissez-faire* was urged and accepted was the consumers' interest,

because in a system of free competition among producers those would survive who best met the need of consumers and so gained their custom. And so, in fact, it is; producers have to give people what they want, or fail. They are able to force what they please upon consumers only in proportion to the absence of free competition. A monopoly is in that position, whether it be private or public, as the State or municipality, or semi-public, as the guild or the union. And that is in fact precisely what monopolies do. Choice varies inversely with control. We all had to take what Government control offered in the war—standard bread, beer, clothes, matches and what not, and we did not like it at all, because we had been accustomed to a free choice for generations. Women, in particular, love a free choice in shopping. The co-operative store never satisfies them; it is always supplemented by shops even in remote colliery villages. But above all, they love the open market. Mrs. Sheridan's pathetic account of the pleasure the poor Muscovites take in visiting the surreptitious market is profoundly true to life. It is the only choice they get; elsewhere, everything is regulated. And regulation is what all the system-mongers aim at.

System means regulation. Under the medieval guild system production was minutely regulated in every detail. In the case of cloth, for instance, not only the materials to be used, but the size, shape and weight of the piece and the mode of weaving were prescribed. There was no scope for enterprise or novelty, and no choice for consumers. Under the mercantile system there was regulation of a different kind, and corresponding curtailment of choice by the exclusion of foreign products and limitation of competition. The *laissez-faire* or free trade theory was that if all restrictions were swept away consumers would get the benefit of the free, competitive market. As for producers, the devil take the hindmost! The object of reintroducing a regulative system is to prevent him from getting them. That is to say, it is in the interest of producers. The antithesis of interest was more clearly seen by Sismondi than it is to-day, but the most acute school of modern systematizers, who are the guildsmen, perceive the need for safeguarding the consumers' interest under their guild scheme, and propose to secure it by vesting ownership in the State as a co-ordinate authority. But the State means regulation too, and is no substitute for individual freedom.

Regulation does not limit freedom the less for being double-barrelled. The freedom of choice which the people still enjoy—except in Soviet Russia—is worth something; how much it is worth would be realized if it were lost.

The theory of increasing misery, as leading inevitably to the overthrow of Capitalism, has become so untenable that it has been modified into the assertion of increasing relative misery. If the poor are better off than they were, it is argued the rich are still more so, and therefore, misery is relatively increasing. It is interesting to note the tacit assumption that misery depends not on one's own condition, but on that of others, and that a better standard of living does not prevent one from being more miserable than before if other people have moved up still higher. But relative misery is not the argument of the Communist Manifesto, or of the Erfurt Programme, or of *Das Kapital*. When Bebel and Kautsky argued at the Lübeck Congress in 1901 that Marx never advanced the theory of increasing absolute misery, and that he regarded the working of capitalist production as merely tending to greater misery, but not necessarily causing it, they abandoned the very citadel of the Marxian position—the principle of *Naturnotwendigkeit*, the inevitable process consummated by the immanent laws of capitalistic production, which he had discovered. No doubt both he and Engels modified their position considerably in later life, so much so that it is impossible to say what they really thought. But it is the older Marx who is taught to young revolutionaries.

Taking the theory of relative misery, however, we may ask how far it is true. Is the gulf between rich and poor wider than it was and being continually widened by Capitalism? Possibly it is in the United States, where there are no European traditions of former social inequality; where the super-rich have reached the loftiest pinnacle, and where money measures social values more crudely than anywhere else. Perhaps too in Germany, where no one was rich thirty or forty years ago, it may be so. But in England and France it is not so. Here, where modern Capitalism was first developed and is most widely extended, there has been within the memory of all of us who are middle-aged, a most remarkable levelling and approximation of classes. To describe it in detail would take too much space, but anyone who remembers and reflects will find evidence of it all about him.

For instance, the visible distinctions of dress, which used to be very pronounced, are rapidly disappearing ; it is often impossible to tell what class persons—especially girls—belong to until they open their mouths. All classes use the railway, the train and the 'bus indiscriminately. No one builds palaces to-day, either in town or country, and no one builds the hovels that used to serve for labourers' homes. The visible distance between the two extremes has greatly diminished, and this is an external sign of a general approximation. There is a fallacy in the assumption that riches beyond a certain point make any difference in actual living conditions ; and if the poorer classes rise towards that point then the real difference between them and the rich diminishes, no matter how much richer the rich may nominally grow.

But all these considerations do not settle the question, though they bear upon it. In spite of the improved conditions of life, the diffusion of innumerable comforts and conveniences, and the approximation towards greater real equality, the campaign against Capitalism has never been so extensive and determined as to-day. Why is this ? Are there any real grounds for it ; and, if so, what are they ? The answer to these questions must be left to another occasion.

A. Shadwell.

THE GROWTH OF LONDON

The Eighteenth Century in London. By E. Beresford Chancellor. B. T. Batsford. 1920.

SOME future historian, laying down Sir Walter Besant's great survey of London, and Booth's industrious record of the life and labour of its people, will congratulate himself and his readers that two such admirably inclusive works were produced at the very time when the capital was about to change both its face and its character. Of the changes accomplished in the preceding hundred years a striking impression can be gained from the series of delightful pictures of eighteenth century London contained in Mr. Beresford Chancellor's book. That the future changes may be even more significant than those already accomplished is possible. In the first twenty years of the present century London revolutionised its road and rail transport, and in the next two decades it may be compelled to revolutionise its architecture. The largely increased demand for offices and shops has necessitated the wholesale demolition of the old two and three-storey houses in the City, and the erection of great blocks of buildings five or six or more floors high. Cheapside and its by-streets as they stand to-day typify the old model ; Kingsway demonstrates the new.

The change in bricks and mortar is the mute witness to the economic expansion and the consequent social changes of the last sixty years ; it marks the completion, not the origin, of a stage in industrial development. The small houses at the Newgate end of Cheapside, and hundreds of similar buildings in narrow City lanes, are the survivals of a bygone commercial age when the merchant lived over his office and the shopkeeper over his shop, as in minor provincial towns to-day. When they moved out to the near suburbs which could be reached by horse-omnibus their old houses in central London were seldom pulled down ; the shop or office remained as before, but the living and sleeping rooms upstairs were converted into inconvenient or incongruous business quarters, and many a caller at one

of these transformed dwelling-houses has echoed Dante's lament, over the bitterness of climbing another man's stairs, as he mounted the steep and narrow flight to a one-time servant's attic where his business was conducted for lack of better accommodation.

The original revolution which divorced a man's occupation from his domestic life may be regretted or approved on various grounds ; it was at least inevitable when the individual business began to give way to the limited company and the board of directors. But while the change was incomplete—when the directors sometimes met in the transformed parlour of their predecessors and the clerks kept their ledgers in what had once been a bedroom—the Londoner was in fact making the worst of both worlds, with the always difficult and recently almost intolerable problem of getting from one to the other added twice a day. The actual transaction of business will be more convenient in the new City, but the increased commercial accommodation and consequently enlarged diurnal population will obviously add to the congestion of inward and outward traffic, and with a probable census of ten millions in 1941 London may almost be choked by its own activities. Unless business can be decentralised—and at present the tide still sets strongly in the other direction—the transport authorities may be driven to convert a recent appeal into a by-law, and refuse to carry any but regular daily passengers between 8 and 10 in the morning and 5 and 7 in the evening.

Some future historian, reviewing the progress and vicissitudes of twenty centuries, may well marvel at the unique destiny which politics and commerce have conferred on London. When the Roman engineers drove Stane Street across the Sussex hills and Surrey heaths, there was probably little to distinguish Chichester from London save the fact that one had nearer access to the sea, while the other stood on the far side of a rather considerable river ; certainly there was nothing to indicate that London would ever exceed in size the combined populations of Rome and Athens, Antioch and Alexandria, or that the then obscure trading centre on a remote island would become the focus of the world's finance, with a civic revenue larger than that of modern Belgium, a census greater than that of Holland, and an administrative unit with a senate of its own.

The causes of this change lie deep in politics and economic history. To our minds a great town is a centre of factories and industrial life, and the country lives by supplying the needs of the town; but the conception is relatively modern, and all previous experience held the direct contrary. Until a hundred years ago the industry of the town was confined to handicrafts, and the country was the essential factory on which the town depended—for that reason perhaps our ancestors saw little romance or beauty in rural life; they knew it too well to be deceived, as Virgil was, by its superficial peace and apparent ease. The main purpose of most towns was to serve the country as the collecting and distributing unit of its produce and requirements, and their size was definitely limited by that fact. If the town was the headquarters of a local government or diocese, it would add a few officials and clergy, and perhaps a garrison of soldiers to its number; the chief town of a province housed a larger administrative unit, and the capital of a kingdom would also accommodate a leisured and propertied class and their attendants, and the *olla podrida* of Falstaffs and Pistols who live by their wits. But unless a place developed an industry of more than local fame, like those of Toledo or Damascus or the cloth of Flanders, the area served by its merchants and tradesmen was the main factor in determining an urban population; and since to this day London is not primarily a manufacturing centre, its growth has evidently been mainly a consequence of the supremacy it attained as a collecting and distributing centre, originally in trade and subsequently in finance.

But that supremacy is relatively recent. For more than sixteen hundred years, in fact, when it was no more than the capital of England, London did not grow very fast; it was strictly comparable with other national capitals, and at the close of the fifteenth century a Venetian traveller considered it about as large as Florence. It was far smaller than cosmopolitan Rome under the Antonines. The old City walls were no larger than those of Paris; and even in Elizabethan days, when an unavailing attempt was made to stay its spread, the houses beyond its bounds were relatively few, apart from where it stretched along the river to the political capital at Westminster. On the east side Bishopsgate and Aldgate were at once the gates of Essex and the open country, and when the traveller had passed some poor

workmen's cottages at the outskirts by Norton Folgate, the Roman Road—its name still survives in Bow—ran straight through marsh and forest out to Colchester. To the south the Borough raised an already disreputable head, the swamps of Southwark had mostly been reclaimed from the wild fowl, and Bermondsey was celebrated for the late magnificence of its recently-suppressed Abbey. The Archbishop's Palace in rural Lambeth marked the end of the long road from Canterbury, and perhaps suggested rather than proved a sense of spiritual remoteness from the material and political interests across the water. But Newington Butts, where an archery school was founded by the Tudors, was hardly even a hamlet on the way to Kennington village ; and two centuries later, when John Wesley tired of Fetter Lane he retreated to the remote peacefulness of Lewisham, whose country air he preferred to the not less quiet village of Hoxton beyond Shoreditch. Almost within living memory the Old Kent Road ran through meadows to the port of Deptford, and Nightingale Lane and Lavender Hill recall but recently forgotten visitors in a part whose more potent scents and music are now provided by the motor-bus.

The present monstrous size of London is the creation of a vigorous second childhood and altered circumstance. It had borne its share, but hardly more than its share, in the business of founding the British Empire. The first American colonies were mostly founded by the men of Devon, and Bristol took the bulk of the American and West Indian trade.* But Londoners put their money bravely in the Virginia Company—La Belle Sauvage Yard in Ludgate Hill still commemorates the beauty of Pocahontas—as they did more than a century later in the South Sea scheme. In both cases they lost their savings ; and it was probably the strong Puritan sentiment of the City rather than any business instinct which lent a hand to the New England Company. Fifty years after Massachusetts was founded the Hudson Bay traffic brought Canada to Leadenhall Street, close by the East India Company, which was the direct creation and for long almost the monopoly of London.

The East India traffic, which presently included Persian and Chinese wares, centred the bulk of European commerce with

*Bermondsey shared some of the Jamaica traffic.

Asia in the Thames when the Dutch lost their grip on the Eastern Seas. It greatly increased the economic power of London, but it was only in the nineteenth century that the capital was finally transformed from a national metropolis into a world's mammoth. The enlargement of the British Empire in the Napoleonic Wars increased its official population, and as a political and philanthropic centre it now accommodated a large floating element. The growth of a leisured class since the Revolution of 1688 had already shifted the fashionable centre from Bloomsbury to Hanover Square, laid out under George I; but a rustic cottage still survives in Little Hertford Street to recall the rural simplicity of eighteenth century Mayfair.

Neither politics nor society, however, nor law nor literature, all of which attracted the ambitious to London, was so potent a stimulus as the new economic system. Everywhere the old handicrafts were giving way before the factories and workshops of the new industrial age. London had neither coal nor iron—and the heavy engineering and fabric trades therefore migrated to the north. If the Kent Collieries, which may yet degrade Canterbury into another Doncaster, had been worked a hundred years ago, or the deeper mineral wealth which geologists believe to lie under Essex had proved accessible, the capital might have been a very different place to-day. But most industries soon found it convenient to open an office in the City for the south of England and the growing export trade. Long since a famous commercial mart, London now outstripped all its rivals and became the leading trade centre of Europe and beyond; and the final step was taken in the year after Waterloo. England introduced the gold standard, and London—already in command of liquid capital from the profits of the new British industries—was soon regarded as the financial pivot of the world. For a hundred years that position was not seriously challenged, and it has not yet been overthrown.

This double concentration of trading and financial power determined the character of the new London. Materially it produced relatively little and consumed much; it was the brain, not the hands, of the world's work. Its position was not finally due to the growth of industry, for it had few great industries, but to the centralisation of mercantile salesmanship and finance. The facade of the Royal Exchange proclaims that the earth is

the Lord's and the fulness thereof. The legend modestly forgets to add that the property can be insured within, the dividends banked across the road, and the accounts audited immediately round the corner.

London was admirably situated for the purpose of the new finance. The grotesque caricatures of the socialist press have recently depicted capitalism and the capitalist as a brutal monster of incredible strength and calculated and remorseless tyranny. The reality is very different. Capital is much more like a woman, whom it resembles in its potential strength and actual timidity, its hatred of isolation and its extreme sensitiveness to external influence. Alone it is helpless, but its attraction is universal; its judgment is so far from being infallible that it is easily tempted by glitter and a glib tongue, and it makes many a misalliance on that score. It is often destroyed by the children to whom it has given birth; and although it shrinks from the actual exercise, it always seeks the neighbourhood of power.

Lombard Street was near enough to Westminster to be informed of the general policy of the one Government whose interests were world-wide, and near enough to the continent to keep in close touch with European affairs, but far enough away to be exempt from political revolutions. The stability of England not only gave it firm foothold but attracted the investor from less securely founded States abroad; and the requirements of those in charge of the industrial development of every continent brought them from the ends of the earth to London.

The change was reflected in the character of the City itself. Under the Plantagenets the craftsmen were the leaders of London. Under the Tudors and Hanoverians the merchants dominated the craftsmen. Under Victoria the banker began to control the merchant. There is no sign whatever that the process is at an end. The recent amalgamations of the joint-stock banks have certainly not diminished their power, and their increased demand for office room in the City since the armistice shows no fear on their part that the war has changed the financial centre of gravity. Indeed, the present political unsettlement on the Continent, and its division into small States with precarious frontiers, extravagant ambitions and inadequate resources, seems likely, so far as the old world is concerned, to strengthen the financial hegemony of London in the immediate future.

The social reactions of this economic revolution were quickly seen. When these mercantile and financial enlargements took definite shape after Waterloo, the value of property rose enormously in the City, and the agents of these increasing activities, whose number was multiplying every day, could no longer live above their offices. A new suburban London then came into existence to accommodate their domestic needs, and its area quickly extended as locomotion improved, until the process in time made the whole of the Home Counties tributary to the capital. Almost every farm from Aylesbury to Dover sent its produce to London ; the nearer villages were swallowed wholesale by the insatiable appetite of the great monster, and prosperous stockbrokers and staid City merchants began to play the country gentleman, and introduce a new feudal system in rural Kent and Surrey.

The details of the process may be studied by any curious enquirer into local history.* Along the crowded Hackney Road pleasant country houses stood a few years ago, whose once spacious gardens are now utilised for warehouse room ; in Homerton near by, paint and varnish works have long since ousted milk and butter, but the old thatched farmhouse and the original dairy of the estate are still intact in the middle of Berger's colour factory. Hackney itself, which a century since boasted a more than local reputation as a pleasant and pretty village, has become a nest of obscure boarding houses and exiguous paying-guests ; here the voice of Mrs. Todgers is heard in the land, a step-mother in Israel. Its neighbour Clapton held its head proudly for many years as the home of prosperous nonconformity, but monied dissent has recently moved to Southend, and the ghetto occupies its mansions. Hornsey and Harringay, and their indistinguishable comrades Highbury and Holloway, are a mere wilderness of houses. Harrow has lost its touch of old distinction these twenty years. Hill and heath preserve to Hampstead a precarious individuality ; but Golders Green, which began as a garden city with new ideals, has become a human nursery garden, and its ideal has taken flesh and now coos gently from the perambulator in every porch.

The south side perhaps keeps something more of the individual characteristics befitting the old approach from the

* Or in Dickens. Mr. Pickwick begins in Goswell Street, E.C., and ends in Dulwich.

continent and the sea. If Balham is the very triumph of commonplace respectability, Clapham still retains the air rather than the actuality of prosperous piety inherited from evangelical Newcome days, while Kennington presents a dignified front which its back streets scarcely live up to, and which is finally lost in the neighbouring squalor of Walworth. Somewhat apart from the rest, Kew simpers in green skirts and Putney displays the white paint of a blameless life—these are the maiden aunts of London ; and Richmond plays the jolly uncle in summer, albeit a prey to damp and the rheumatics later in the year.

Unhappily this process of urban expansion, unparalleled in the world's history, was carried through too quickly ; and still more unfortunately, it came at a time of general bad taste and low civic traditions. It is comprehensible that London, which centralised everything else, should fail to centralise itself ; but it would need an authority on aesthetics to account for the extreme degradation of British architecture between 1800 and 1870. Partisans have declared that Protestantism ruined the art of church building, but justification by faith can scarcely be charged with the decay of domestic architecture. The Tudor mansion, the Georgian house, and the small cottage of the rural labourer were beautiful examples of applied art ; but the Victorian industrial street became a mere series of partitioned boxes in endless succession, lacking dignity, style, or ornament, and devoid of any quality save monotony and permanence.

Mr. H. G. Wells remarked in ' Tono-Bungay ' that the urban builder preserved the remnants of an old aristocratic tradition in a finally attenuated form. But what most strikes the explorer of the dormitory suburbs is the absence of any tradition whatever in their construction ; these people, caught in the flood of a new economic sea, found none of the old familiar landmarks of the country town and countryside in their petty streets. The bleak hinterland of Kentish Town and the endless steppes of Islington were not even a conscious experiment in town-planning ; the demand for houses created the supply, but it created nothing else.

That is probably the main reason for the regular monotony of the inner suburbs. The builder had always before thought in terms of an individual house which an individual family was to live in, but he now built houses wholesale for no particular occupant. He standardised a tenantry whom he probably never

saw, as the contemporary manufacturer standardised his goods; and he assumed that the new standard would last, for he built strongly and solidly on a ninety-nine years' lease. (The gimcrack bijou villa of the outer suburbs is the creation of a later day, when art came in and foundations went out.)

Until 1914 London increased its population by a steady fifty to a hundred thousand a year; and by the early twentieth century, when the habit of daily travel grew, its actual subjects were far more numerous than the census admitted, for it had recently annexed, in an economic and social sense, many places which lay far beyond its municipal bounds. Croydon and Bromley were now as suburban as Ealing; Brighton and Southend were little more than outer suburbs by the sea. Even the South Eastern Railway, which strove hard to maintain the ancient tradition that Christianity took several years to travel from Canterbury to London, could only retard the modern conquest of Kent,* which was presently invaded by other agencies. Downe Village, fifteen miles from London, where Darwin worked in quiet, still preserved its isolation from the world; but Keston, the country home of Pitt, where Wilberforce had sketched his plan for the emancipation of the slaves, was awakened from the sleep of a century by the motor-bus.

The war appeared to stay this expansion for a time by stopping building. But the appearance was delusive. In fact it increased the political and industrial activities of London, and it therefore merely aggravated the actual pressure of population without increasing the accommodation. Since the mammoth could no longer grow naturally, its organs became congested.

History will record that the last chance of limiting the growth of London was lost when the Allies won the war. Had Germany emerged victorious, the political supremacy of Europe, and perhaps of the world, would have passed to Berlin, and the ensuing destruction of the British Empire would have deprived London of much of its administrative population. Financial supremacy would also have migrated to the Hohenzollern headquarters, in

* It is only fair to admit that this railway rose to the occasion in 1914, when it was called upon to deal with very heavy military traffic, and it is now one of the best in England. Every traveller on the South Eastern Railway to-day, who remembers what it was in 1900, will admit that the war was not fought wholly in vain.

accordance with the universal desire of capital for a close liaison with politics ; and some at least of the merchants would have been compelled to follow the bankers. Had peace been dictated at Potsdam instead of Versailles, the fate of London might have been that of Vienna, a metropolis which has lost its empire, the head of a dismembered body whose hands refuse to feed it, and whose once dependent organs can no longer nourish it.

The winning of the war has been the direct cause of another mighty increase in the enlargement of London, which is now only beginning, and of which it would be foolish to prophesy the end. But the conditions have in the meantime a little changed. Immediately before 1914 the supply of houses had slightly outrun the demand ; there were many streets of empty tenements and villas in some neighbourhoods such as Islington and Belsize Park. Basement houses stood empty for years, owing to the difficulties of domestic service ; the great roomy mansions of the prolific Victorian age were largely let out in tenements or converted into flats, the smaller families of the ascendant social class of Edwardian times preferring a self-contained residence in the outskirts, in such rural suburbs as Pinner or Purley. But during and immediately after the war the increasing population of London was compelled to occupy the deserted inner houses again ; and the raising of rents and railway fares, combined with the manifold discomforts of the no longer adequate suburban traffic systems, operated as an additional lever in reversing the outward flow of working humanity—particularly as regards those who were less fortunately situated in the general struggle for economic power which rising prices compelled and rising wages symbolised.

By the beginning of 1920 the inner ring of residential London was again seriously congested ; the overcrowding was at once a cause and an effect of a further increase of prices, and, if long continued, its unfortunate effects on the physical health of the community are likely to be cumulative. In these circumstances, it is natural that another attempt should be made to decentralise London. Some years before the war, an interesting and not entirely unsuccessful experiment had been started in that direction by the foundation of a garden city, with its own factories and workshops, at Letchworth near Hitchin ; many trades followed the example by establishing themselves along the North-Western

Railway Line between Willesden and Watford : and a new garden city, again with its own industries, is about to be laid out at Welwyn in Hertfordshire.

It would be a gross injustice to the authors of a very admirable experiment to suggest that their remedy has had about as much effect as a poultice on the trunk of an elephant in relieving it of cerebral congestion. Garden cities have in fact improved the social conditions and industrial circumstances of many thousands of workers ; they may yet prove to have been the first step towards the abolition of slums.* But they have done nothing whatever to relieve the pressure of population on the metropolis. Every factory which is vacated in London is almost immediately occupied by another enterprise, and the surrounding houses merely change their inhabitants ; every industry which settles in a garden city necessarily maintains an office in Central London, whose several employees possibly live in another suburb altogether.

Only industry can be decentralised by this means, and that only partially ; the merchant and financier still conduct their affairs in London. Politics and the law are still centralised at Westminster, stubbornly conservative against every attempt at reform ; journalism, located by chance between the lawyer's devil and the deep sea of City finance, sees in the decay of the provincial press the increasing predominance of Fleet Street. The ancient seats of learning at Cambridge and Oxford survive without difficulty the new competition of London University, but there is a visible tendency for intellectual as well as material interests to centre in and around the metropolis.

For these and other reasons the garden cities cannot relieve the pressure in London. Walthamstow and other districts in the neighbourhood of Epping Forest grow as fast as Letchworth ; enormous new residential areas on the old suburban plan are now preparing or building at Feltham and Dagenham which will accommodate a larger population than Welwyn. Every borough council with a few vacant acres has its housing scheme, and new

*It is usual to debit slums to the evil account of modern industry. The contrary is the case ; they are the decaying relic of a far older social process, which dates from the imperfect adjustment of man from his original rural to his eventual urban character. There was a larger proportion of slums in medieval cities than in the present day.

streets are already springing up at places as far afield as Acton and Worcester Park. Unless some entirely unforeseen change of economic and political forces intervenes, it will be at least ten years before the builders can provide roofs for the waiting crowds. The new houses will be smaller, and the rents higher—a prospect which in itself raises very difficult questions—but the need for them becomes more urgent every day, if the health of the infants born since the war is to be preserved.

The enormous prospective increase in the size of London makes it more than probable that some change in its local government may become necessary. Already the suggestion has been made that the whole of the Home Counties should be incorporated as a unified area under the London County Council. The proposal will be resented by every local interest, and perhaps by Parliament itself, which even now watches with an interest not altogether devoid of jealousy the rising of the new municipal buildings across the water. The House of Commons may yet be resentful of too near a rival to its authority. But if the local feeling of the less suburbanised Home Counties continues to object, it is obvious that this feeling will tend to diminish as London spreads its tentacles further afield ; and the opposition in the metropolis itself may yet be overcome by the ever-growing pressure of rising rates, which are perhaps the most serious menace to the future prosperity of the capital.

Local sentiment in any case is always obliterated where London puts its foot ; no man ever boasted that he was born in Stoke Newington. The new immigrant population remember for a time their old provincial homes, and Societies of Devon and Dorset and other county men have been founded in London ; but they recognise no particular allegiance to the suburb in which they live, and from which an upward or downward change of individual economic circumstance may promote or expel them. Chislehurst is a successful Beckenham, Streatham an ascendant Brixton, Wandsworth a decadent Wimbledon, and Poplar a Sargasso Sea.

But if the Londoner is deficient in local pride, no critic has impugned his sturdy patriotism. He has ever regarded the foreigner as a kind of God's folly ; for the pure countryman his attitude is that of the townsman the world over. Since the country exists to feed the town, it is meet and right that somebody

should live there, but to live in the country is to incur the negative penalty of the innocent unfortunates in the first circle of the Inferno. They do not actually suffer, but they are irrevocably lost.

The numbers, and perhaps the situation of the Londoner, give him a general consciousness of superiority which survives all attack. A proverb, presumably of Lancastrian origin, assures the world that what Manchester thinks to-day England will think to-morrow. What Manchester thinks to-day is doubtless always right, but its local verity is notwithstanding of no greater practical importance in the Cockney's eyes than what Leeds thought yesterday, unless London chooses to endorse it.

Yet the temper of the capital has changed, as is only to be expected in a city recruited so largely from outside. A medieval chronicler denounced the Londoners as 'extremely 'proud and avaricious, unbelievers in God and the ancient 'traditions, maintainers of the Lollards, slanderers of religious 'persons, detainers of tithes, and impoverishers of the common 'people.' Hatred, like beauty, is here in the eye of the beholder; but Froissart also held that 'the common people are the periloust 'people of the world and most outrageoust, and specially in 'England, and specially the Londoners; and they were hardy and 'high of courage: the more blood they saw shed, the less they were 'abashed.' The intolerance and brutality of the London mob were proverbial in the days of Charles II and George III,* but a Cockney crowd to-day is the most orderly and kindly in the world, and its cherished weapon is irony. Now the man who is habitually ironic is incapable of the more irrational forms of anger.

It is not degeneration of physique that has caused the change, for in the late war London troops showed at least as much endurance as the county regiments. Physically, in fact, the new London has been an extraordinarily successful experiment.† In

*The military guard round the Bank of England dates from the Gordon riots of 1780.

†Natural selection has of course played its part in bringing the ambitious, who are generally physically strong and mentally alert, to London; Dick Whittington is the legendary hero of a million followers. But the poor human driftwood of the provinces has also been sucked into the metropolitan vortex, there to find the obscurity which the immensity of London so readily concedes.

the Middle Ages the City was probably no better and no worse than any other urban area; its streets were filthy, its open sanitation primitive, and its population thinned by plague every few years. But the Metropolitan Board of Works and other authorities changed all that for the better. It is often said even now that London consumes and does not produce population. The exact contrary is the case. The City, which is only inhabited by caretakers and charwomen, is indeed sterile, but Greater London produces a large surplus of births over deaths. Its health statistics are the envy of Continental cities, and some of the outlying suburbs, such as Ilford, have a lower mortality than many a watering-place which advertises the longevity conferred by its climate.

Not physical decadence, but mental stagnation, has provided a more accessible target. The casual spectator, wearied by the unending monotony of mean or genteel streets, is not surprised to read the indictment of Suburbia as a land of Philistines and platitudes, in which convention rules, a place where souls as well as suits are made to measure, and spiritual dry-rot spreads. The relevance of the criticism can hardly be ignored, or its partial justice denied. The clergy complain that London is either indifferent or purely formal in its belief. It is true that the capital has usually been as moral as can reasonably be expected of man in a naughty world, and decently religious rather than devout. It will hear a great preacher with respect, but contentedly leaves the fervour of revivals to the provinces. On the whole it prefers ethics to emotion, and will subscribe more readily to an orphanage than confess its sins.

The Church is always professionally pessimistic, but life from other aspects seems to bear it out. The suburban bookstall offers the alternatives of shockers or slop. The London theatre has become so contemptible that even the managers are apparently ashamed of their wares, and cut the play as short as possible. The cinema, which might have provided, and indeed may yet provide, a new medium of art, seems already strangled in its own conventions; yet it is crowded every night. There is a sense in which the Cockney seeks his emotions, as he plays his games, at second-hand because there is no room for anything else. It is his business to make money; he leaves to others the perilous adventure of life.

But the indictment cannot be pressed too far. As a commercial city engrossed in trade London has always been accused of materialism. Never was slander more gross nor untruth more palpable; it has been the very nursery of poets. Chaucer, a true Londoner, in his kindly tolerance of nature and deep interest in man, was born in Thames Street by Walbrook, Spenser at East Smithfield near the Tower, Milton in Bread Street, Cheapside, Pope in Lombard Street, Blake the mystic in Golden Square, Keats in Moorfields, and Browning and Swinburne were both Londoners. The list would easily become almost a catalogue of English letters. Ben Jonson and Bacon were both sons of Westminster, but Defoe was a true Cockney of St. Giles, Cripplegate. Newman was born in Broad Street in the heart of the City, Lamb in Crown Office Row, Ruskin in Brunswick Square, and Sir Thomas Browne off Cheapside. Huxley and Trollope, and Gilbert and Sullivan, were all Londoners. No other city in the world can show so long a roll of famous names in literature; the temple of Mammon has been the true fount of the divine fire.

London has indeed been monstrously libelled and too little praised; even the Cockney holds a deprecating tone, as when speaking of his wife—but in both cases too long a separation makes him miserable. For forty years of active work he dreams of a cottage in the country; but when the time comes, the mellowed judgment of maturity often prefers the busy pavement.

The birthplace of poets, no poet has sung London adequately, for Johnson's laboured verses are deservedly forgotten, and only Wordsworth's lines on seeing the sunrise from Westminster Bridge have obtained a general currency. But Wordsworth was only a countryman, and naturally preferred London when it was asleep, and therefore most like the country. The majesty of London deserves an epic on the gigantic model of 'The Dynasts,' not a sonnet; and the beauty of its physical garment, like the life it covers and in part reveals, is wholly its own—yet it must not be sought, for it reveals itself in strange times and in sundry places.

There are days when Oxford Street is merely a noisy highway, but if it had been planned by an artist to catch the dying sun's farewell it could not furnish a richer hue of burnished copper and gold than on an August evening. Fortunately if the vision

prove too ecstatic, it can easily be exorcised, for close by lies Harley Street, most depressing of thoroughfares in appearance and trade, and one in which, as in those still more dreary shades to which it leads, they all hope abandon who enter there.

Every Cockney, it is true, rhapsodises over the view from Richmond Hill, which at its best is almost equal to a picture-postcard ; but this is not the capital at all, but the country as it should be seen—from a discreet distance. It is not here that the secret of London will be found. But twenty miles down-stream, there is a little public garden on the Isle of Dogs by which the moving traffic of the river passes like a pageant, with Greenwich as a splendid curtain, and from the heights of the Observatory opposite the full panoply of London lies outstretched beneath a nocturne of cloud and smoke. Here, as the steamers hoot a melancholy farewell to the world's magnet while they drop below Bugsby's Marsh, the heart of London can almost be seen to beat through its greatest artery.

No foreigner has ever been known to speak of London without a sneer at its fogs, but few have praised the unrivalled delicacy of its mists and twilight, which Venice cannot equal nor even Paris imitate. Yet on a late autumn afternoon the air takes on a pearly opalescence which makes the whole capital a place of mystery and romance, when its brooding beauty seems a thing not of this nor of any known world, but the insubstantial city of a dream in another dimension. The vision fades, and the grey monotony of brick and slate returns, but for some brief moments the metropolis has been transfigured by a glory not its own ; for it is not at Tintern Abbey, but on the Thames Embankment, and in the improbable neighbourhood of the Exchequer and Audit Department, that the light that never was on sea or land may be most nearly realised.

A. Wyatt Tilby.

THE HEAD OF THE HILL

The Harrow Life of Henry Montagu Butler, D.D. By Edward Graham. With an Introductory Chapter by Sir George O. Trevelyan, Bart., O.M. Longmans, Green. 1920.

DR. Henry Montagu Butler was in some respects unique as a great headmaster, and he was absolutely unique in his governance of Harrow. Never has there been one so intimately, it might be said racially, bound up with a great public school, or so personally the genius of its place. He was the son, a ninth child, of Dr. Butler, the first who stamped a strong individuality on the school where he was teased and bewildered by the young Byron. His mother sprang from the Grays of the adjacent Wembley Park, and, like his own first wife, was bred and married at Harrow. His grandfather died there. His uncle Oxenden served long as its 'lower master,' and his brother George preceded him as a Harrow boy. To crown all, his descendants were to perpetuate the lustre of the Hill and of a family thus associated with it, through four generations. Not only, again, was he the Arnoldian Dr. Vaughan's pet pupil, but by name and nature—of dynastic right—he was as much predestined to sway Harrow as the younger Pitt had been to sway England. And, throughout, he worshipped Herga with the devotion of a knight or troubadour. Like his favourite Tennyson's Geraint, he

> ' . . . loved her as he loved the light of Heaven,
> And as the light of Heaven varies, now
> At sunrise, now at sunset, now by night
> With noon and trembling stars, so loved Geraint
> To make her beauty vary day by day
> In crimson and in purples and in gems.'

From the Burke whom he knew by heart he must have remembered that ' To be loved she must be lovely,' and from his Tennyson again, that ' Beauty must go beautifully.' He made her blossom like the rose :—

> ' Super campos caput tollis,
> Quam dilecta nostra collis.'

Gifted with high talents and high character, at once refined and robust, precise and sympathetic, a puritan-cavalier, he

wielded an influence as permanent as it was wide. He gave Harrow both a soul and an anthology: he sublimated and incarnated the Harrow ideal. And his fine humour, his intimacy with the best in literature and life (though his own perhaps was over-sheltered), preserved a sanity and a sense of perspective too rare as a rule in pedagogues. He was an artist in education, which Dr. Arnold, with all his mental and moral fibre, can hardly be said to have been. His courtly manners, his happy speeches and verses, his love of traditions which he not only pursued but founded, his unpreachified preaching, his passion for friendship and adoration of heroes, even his Vandyke hand, all these characterised a personality ruled from within by a conscience rigorously Christian. And if his mien and voice sometimes left an impression of over-nicety, this fastidiousness, like his taste and tact, formed part of his *morale*. The Hill was more than the ladylove of his heart, it was his holy of holies—a 'mons 'sacer.' His accomplishments were his surface.

To understand Butler we must know the Butlers. Mr. Graham has given a romantic record of that highly specialised stock. His task in this first volume has not been easy, for it is hard to adjust breadth of mind and spirit to an atmosphere so local. He has had to respect and satisfy the anticipations, sometimes the vanity, of colleagues and clerics, and often to dwell on things and interests academic. But he fully recognises that Butler was more than a prize-prizeman, or the monarch of a microcosm. With a faith more ardent and simple, with a stimulus far more winning, and a glamour far more poetical, he may be called the Jowett of Harrow, and Jowett became a warm friend. He touched the big world at many points, and proved a quick judge of character. Mr. Graham has never overlooked his centrality in the maze of detail which he has been forced to track. The past was in Butler's blood as it never was in Jowett's. He belongs to the eighteenth century.

In the seventeenth, the Butlers were Worcestershire squirelings, but they emerge in the person of Montagu's grandfather Weedon. This eccentric and lovable being was the first of his breed to go adventuring on life's highway, as all the virility did of that period. The son of a country solicitor at one time settled at Rye, he chafed at his father's desk. Eager to dedicate himself to the ministry, he long searched for its noblest call and

found it in the national church. Unlike his posterity, he had escaped a university education. Ordained, he became secretary to the notorious Dr. Dodd, to whom (even in Newgate), he remained trustfully faithful, and through whom he met Lord Chesterfield. He was both a bibliophile and a philanthropist in many directions, and hence perhaps arises the Butlerian worship of Wilberforce. He became incumbent and part proprietor of St. George's, Hanover Square, and a chaplain to the Duke of Kent. But his chief activities were those as headmaster of a notable school at Chelsea, where, we have heard, he made the acquaintance of Burke in the days when the Whigs had flouted and forsaken him. Here again is the source of Butler's veneration for the chivalrous anti-Jacobin. Garbed in a bob wig and gaiters, Weedon was popularly known as 'the Bishop of Chelsea,' but so far from being elevated to any see, he settled down in old age, after many bereavements, as curate to his son George at Gayton, in the county of the Spencers.

He had married a lady of French extraction—Miss Giberne—from whom her grandson was to inherit his love of grace and of *le mot juste*. But after all, the amiable Weedon was the father of his son George, whose headmastership he hailed, and in whose arms he expired.

Dr. George Butler was indeed a remarkable figure, a man of action who was almost incidentally a great scholar like his father, a rector, a dean and a headmaster. Bold, venturesome, versatile, practical, resolute, he had early wayfared in Germany, where he owed his life in an escape from robbery and murder to his promptness and resource—where, too, he met Goethe and also Schiller who read his 'Wallenstein' aloud to him. A Cambridge graduate, he was in 1814 preferred by his College to the Northamptonshire living of Gayton, where he soon became the squire of his peasants, teaching them by precept and example how to do their own business and care both for their souls and bodies. He was a sportsman, one of the best fencers of his day, and an excellent rider, skater and swimmer. Even in his old age he plunged into a half-frozen canal and rescued a wretched young woman from suicide. An agriculturalist, a scientist, a linguist, a stylist, a classicist, a critic, a devotee of architecture and the arts, as well as of the muses, he presents a combination worthy of the Renaissance. In 1805, when Dr. Drury resigned,

Harrow was not at its zenith, either in numbers or in quality. George Butler actually dared to enter the lists at the age of thirty-one, and was appointed headmaster and eventually enabled to accept his comfortable living where he worked in the holidays. No sooner had he been installed than a mutiny broke out. He crushed it promptly, and George the First of Harrow received the thanks of George the Third of England. Generous to a fault, he extended his benefactions even to delinquents when discipline had been restored, and would regale them with fine old Madeira. He was Butler the Magnificent. Byron, who proved inveterate and satirised him as 'Pomposo,' ended by making the *amende honourable*, but Mr. Graham has not chronicled the letter in which the young poet declined an invitation to dinner. Dr. George Butler improved Harrow in every possible way. He stinted nothing out of his own purse and exercised both taste and judgment. He built the west-wing of the school house in complete harmony with the old. He established 'Founders Day'; and when he retired in 1829 to Gayton, he left the school on the road to fame and fortune. Gratefully in 1842 did he accept from Sir Robert Peel 'the pride 'and glory of our Ida,' the Deanery of Peterborough, and as 'the *Dane*' he was loved and feared by his parishioners. He lived to be seventy-nine, and had he survived a few years longer would have witnessed the unexpected triumph of his youngest son—the Benjamin of his hopes.

Henry Montagu was born on July 2nd, 1833. His early life was passed entirely at Gayton till 1840, when it was divided between that place and Peterborough. His surroundings therefore were mainly those of a country parish and a cathedral town, tinctured with classical accomplishment and church aspirations. But his father's marked individuality lay behind and shone through all this environment. It was the more needed because his son was delicate from birth. By a happy coincidence, despite the public spirited openhandedness which was a family keynote, their circumstances were easy, and the outdoor life and humours of the village, which long afterwards set the brothers laughing so late and loudly at their yearly reunion, that a lady in the house fancied that some crime was being perpetrated, formed a healthy corrective to the intellectualities of the home. He went to a good private school where he showed great promise,

shared his sisters' devotion to the music of Handel and Mendelssohn (ever his ideals), but save for the death of a beloved sister, and the marriage of a charming young lady whom Goethe would have called 'eine schöne seele,' his youth went unchequered. It was on November 5th, 1846, that he was taken to Harrow, and the house of Dr. Vaughan, who, since Longley's resignation, had succeeded the slack Dr. Wordsworth.

It was an ever remembered anniversary for the man who yearly commemorated the leading days in his own life, those in the school's history, and those in Great Britain's. 'It was just about a 'quarter to four,' he wrote, seventy-three years onwards, 'that my 'dear father took me to Harrow and handed me over to Dr. 'Vaughan. The boys in their coloured football vests were 'swarming up the hill as we drove past.' 'How little,' comments Mr. Graham, 'could he have anticipated that he would see 'from those study windows that familiar sight repeated every 'day in the football season for five and twenty years of his own 'Headmastership.' But 'everything is ordained, yet man is 'nevertheless master of his own actions.' To such as insist on the supremacy of environment over heredity we commend the bead-roll of the Butlers. Character creates events far more than the converse, and character it was even more than immense attainments that won him his place in the school and on its cricket field, and endeared him to many life-long friends.

To the account of his entrance on Harrow life may be added the following anecdote which he told to the present writer. When his father left him, a big boy who shared his room, 'stuck a 'penknife in my wrist,' (we can hear his staccato tones), and said, 'There's for you, you little *something*.'

At Harrow he went on from strength to strength, winning practically all the prizes, and golden opinions from all sorts of people. He was 'felix opportunitate vitæ,' for he had relatives to tend him, and even when he distinguished himself at cricket a boy to run for him, as Lord Byron with his club foot had had long before. His mother was inclined to demur to the exertions entailed by his playing for the school at Lords, but he addressed a very firm and tactful letter home in this regard. When he quitted Harrow for Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1851, no one was more popular. 'And so ends my Harrow life,' he wrote, 'which I could almost wish to live over again,

' at all events I can hardly expect that the next three years, if ' I live so long, will be equally happy.' Yet they were.

He repaired to Trinity as the Marcellus of his generation. But before he did so, he had rivetted and returned the attachment of a younger boy with whom he was to travel abroad. This was Sir George Trevelyan, who introduced him to his uncle, Lord Macaulay, and who contributes a prologue at once admiring and appraising to this volume. Never did Butler lose touch with friends or pupils. His heart was a diary, not only of association, but of affection.

At Cambridge, there was nothing that he did not gain. And he was thrown with men of new ideas who affected his ideals, such as Davies and Frederick Denison Maurice. At the Union he stood pre-eminent, and from his friendship with the late Lord Spencer, he seemed marked out for a political career. But ' festina lente ' was ever his rule. Like his grandfather Weedon, he went in quest of a vocation, and not Milton himself was ever vowed to spiritual ambition more cloistrally yet with less cloistral asceticism. Friendship, the society of noble souls, social service and hero-worship engaged him. He became a fellow of Trinity, and tutor of his college. One snatch, original under all the circumstances, must be given from his Cambridge correspondence. It is addressed in 1854 to his sister Catherine :—

' I consider Oxford and Edinburgh—perfectly different of course—by far the finest and most interesting cities in Great Britain. I sympathize thoroughly with the feeling which leads so many people to idolize Oxford as the ideal seat of Toryism and of the old ' Church and King ' feeling. Of course there is a great deal of bigotry mixed up with this, but I believe those who are without the instructive reverence which such a place and such ideas naturally give rise to are without some of the very noblest elements that go to make up a perfect character.'

Already he desired the statesmanship that would adapt reverence to reform. For years he thought to have found it in Gladstone, till he recognised that he could not ' govern.' Always he believed in the Harrovian, Peel, and sometimes (on the literary side, enthusiastically) in Disraeli. Once more, at this period, in the playful vein : ' I do hope when we ' come to be 50, we shall not be looked upon by our nephews ' and nieces as very old fogies. When this young gentleman is

'12, we shall be 36 and 32 respectively, *you* as old as Byron and 'Pascal, and *I* as old as Alexander the Great. . . .' His Cambridge associations enlarged his horizon; they threw him into the direction of Ruskin and Kingsley, and brought him into contact with Tennyson.

Butler already meditated a parliamentary career, though the Church was also in his mind. He found an apprenticeship to public life in his appointment as private secretary to Temple Cowper, Vice-President of the Education Board. During this period, his sphere, both social and intellectual, was further widened. Assiduous at his duties, he was thrown with men and women 'of light and leading.' Not every sub-official, too, would study Dante as he did, on the top of an omnibus. Italy he loved, and he flung himself into her cause. And his many travelled heart and mind were seasoned by the experiences of tours with friends in Germany, Switzerland, Greece, Egypt, Syria and the Holy Land. Official life, however, did not satisfy him. At last, in 1859, on Vaughan's resignation, there came a sudden call to the Harrow headmastership. In some respects it was a sacrifice, in others an ideal. He never hesitated, and, accepting the call, he found himself before he had turned twenty-seven the successor to his father's throne.

What were his achievements during his long reign? We have only space for a few special features. There is a magic in youth, but outside the deep Westcott and the flowery Farrar—each dear to him—Butler had to manage an old fashioned set of assistant masters to whom a leader's youth scarcely commends itself. And even the boys were not easily conciliated at first by one whose attributes were so uncommon. But very soon his tact and playful earnestness, his understanding of boys and men, prevailed. He knew when to compromise and when to be uncompromising. Stupidity was never his bugbear; it, as well as idleness, he wished to win over. But perverseness or vice were rooted out with a ruthless hand. He carried on his father's hospitality, and his monitors will never forget his dinner parties, at one of which he introduced me to *Coningsby*. His teaching was not only that of a most accurate scholar, but he made the dry bones live. Sins against the light were sternly visited; nor did he ever yield to the false philanthropy which would spare the rod.

He held up the standard of ' playing the game ' in every sphere, and of a manly Christianity which he embodied in his enthusiasm for the heroes of history both Christian and pagan. Gradually he rallied round him a wonderful set of boys and of masters, who included Edward Bowen and Boswell Smith, till in the seventies, and almost coincident with her tercentenary, there came the hey-day of Harrow both in work and play. His cricket memory, like his book memory, was infallible. Vaughan had given Harrow a splendid tone, but Butler added an atmosphere which has adhered. He looked both before and after, even in the face of the Government Commissioners, preferring reform to revolution. He showed a statesmanship that would have stood him in good stead had he entered parliamentary life, by attuning old traditions to new needs. His eldest sister had married Galton, and he was kept in touch with science. He insisted on the modern school being an independent realm and no mere province. And in music, he helped to create a new world by his early perception of John Farmer's possibilities, and the consequent response to the Harrow Sullivan of Edward Bowen as the Harrow Gilbert. The result was a cycle of folk songs and national anthems among which ' Forty years on ' has become proverbial in every part of the globe. He got Joachim down to play before the boys. He studied individuality more than any teacher whom we have known, and kept conversance and companionship with the careers even of the undistinguished, nor least with Anglo-Indians, for through his marriage with an Elliot he knew and loved every corner of Anglo-Indian history.

Many an old pupil treasures his letters ; not least the present writer, who prizes them from the eighties to the days of terrible ordeal and bereavement during the Great War. He delighted to gather Harrovians around him, and made of Harrow a Hill of Zion, whither the dispersed tribes continually repaired ; and he helped weakness as only the strong can. Of Speech Day he made both an event and an occasion. Figure after figure gravitated under his auspices to the Hill, from the Pylades and Orestes, the ' Old Ponsonby and Grimston,' of whom he sang in the humorous ditty to the tune of the British Grenadiers, to Charles Kingsley, Matthew Arnold, and the young Duke of Genoa. There was no trace of the prig in his composition. Perhaps his only drawbacks were those of over-refinement. He shrank from the

realistic literature even of Thackeray, and save in Pickwick he could never really relish Dickens. Few that heard it will forget his announcement to the school of his second son's birth—'I am 'sure you will all be glad to hear that Teddy has a little brother.'

For the township itself too he effected much, and reinstated the Harrow School for the townspeople on its proper footing. Building on building, benefaction on benefaction, attest Butler's magnetism, and could one of the first prize-founders, Sir Robert Peel, come to life, he would hardly know the place again. Of the Chapel he made a shrine—'laborare est orare.'

His whole life was a dedication. Both the man and the book demand a longer survey, but we may close with a part of the beautiful hymn which he wrote for Harrow. There are tears in its voices.

'For all the faith and daring
That haunt our ancient Hill.
And patience and forbearing,
Tried good and vanquished ill.
Sweet praise of our dear Mother,
And sweeter far than fame,
The love which binds each brother—
We glorify Thy name.

For memory's golden treasure
Our boyhood's cloudless brow,
Each pure and blameless pleasure,
Each brave and holy vow;
And friends still clinging nearer
As sorrows cross our way,
And some by death made dearer,
We thank thee, Lord, to-day.'

WALTER SICHEL.

THE FUNCTION OF LITERARY CRITICISM

1. The Works of Benedetto Croce. Filosofia dello spirito, Vol. I. Estetica, 1900 ; Saggi filosofici, Vol. V. Nuovi Saggi di Estetica, 1920 ; Scritti di storia Letteraria e politica, Vol. XIV, Ariosto, Shakespeare e Corneille, 1920. Bari : Laterza e Figli.
2. Croce's Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic. With introduction and historical summary by DOUGLAS AINSLIE. Macmillan. 1909.
3. The Philosophy of Benedetto Croce. By H. WILDON CARR. Macmillan. 1917.
4. Croce's Aesthetic. By BERNARD BOSANQUET. In *Proceedings of the British Academy*.
5. Aspects of Literature. By J. MIDDLETON MURRY. Collins. 1920.
6. The Art of Letters. By ROBERT LYND. Fisher Unwin. 1920.
7. Life and Letters. By J. C. SQUIRE. Hodder and Stoughton. 1920.

LITERARY criticism in this country is not wholly autonomous. It works less often from an inward impulse than in response to an external stimulus. That stimulus is the new book which has to be reviewed. Much of the book-reviewing is thoroughly mechanical and incompetent, but a large number of intelligent writers do exercise their critical faculties in occasional reviews, and some of the best critical writing of to-day is to be found in certain weekly periodicals. From time to time some of these critics collect into a book their scattered leaves, if they can find a willing publisher. To such a book they may give a sonorous title—' The Art of Letters ' for instance—but, as a rule, the only obvious unity holding together its parts is the purely physical unity of a strong cloth binding. A deeper unity may be there, but, owing to the conditions of composition, there has been no space or time in which to develop it. The critic, confronted by the latest samples of the book market, cannot entirely consult his own taste. By choosing with skill he can certainly escape the fate of dealing with the purely ephemeral, and bring in good literature by a side-wind ; but still, week after week, he must jump like a grasshopper from one leaf of literary grass to another, often with little premeditation. He must always be entertaining and to the point : he can follow out no lure of thought nor even indulge in the purely argumentative. That is why the recent

collections of Mr. Robert Lynd, for all his good sense, of Mr. J. C. Squire, for all his singular charm of manner, and of Mr. Middleton Murry, for all his intense conviction, are medleys rather than firmly articulated contributions to criticism. When Autolycus offers us such admirable wares as Mr. Lynd and Mr. J. C. Squire (who is only Autolycus on Fridays), we have no reason to complain because the wares are jumbled : but when a writer so obviously abhors jumble as Mr. Middleton Murry, then we regret the conditions which impose upon him the pack of Autolycus.

From the quality of the critical essays in ' Aspects of Litera- ' ture,' there is no doubt that Mr. Middleton Murry has the vision of a true critic : time may develop him into a great one. Among our younger critics he stands out as one who really knows what he is after, who has a definite conception of art and of criticism, whose standards are not shifting nor his values haphazard. His opening chapter on ' The Functions of Criticism ' was written as an epilogue, and it is interesting to leave its reading to the last, thus testing his power to make his convictions explicit in his practice before hearing their definite statement. Though in no sense is this book the development of a single idea, the definite attitude which runs through his treatment of such widely different subjects as Rousseau, Keats, Tchehov and Thomas Hardy, forces itself upon the reader's mind. On the aesthetic side, not only, being a poet himself, does he appreciate and write with deep poetic feeling of the art he is considering, but he firmly grounds himself on that solid rock of good criticism, which is that the central problem of artistic creation is the ' unified aesthetic impression.' Unity of vision, so intense as to comprehend all humanity in a particular scene or symbol, is for him the sign of a great artist.

This unity of vision is what he praises, almost with the fervour of a worshipper, in Tchehov's prose and Thomas Hardy's poetry. But the fervour does not gush up out of a soul merely bubbling with aesthetic ecstasy ; it comes from a profound intellectual and emotional conviction of value in the work of the greatest artists. And this value is a moral value, not in the conventional sense, but in the sense that art is not only a vision, but an attitude to the whole of life. Mr. Middleton Murry is, perhaps, hardly aware himself how very obvious he makes his

own attitude. His rather yearning pessimism, sombrely tinted by the disillusionments of the last six years, is naturally attracted by Rousseau, by Edward Thomas's poetry, by the Keats of the revised Induction to Hyperion and, above all, by the poetry of Hardy. Without seeming to smile at Mr. Middleton Murry's emotions, one may hold it possible, since he believes in development, that some years hence, in retrospect, he will observe a tendency in this attitude of his which is not artistic at all, but just a moral thirstiness that will, we may hope, be satisfied and pass away. Nevertheless, the relation of art to morality is a central point in his conception of a critic's function, and it is worth while to dwell upon this for a moment, since it at once so strongly contrasts and coincides with Benedetto Croce's noble conception of a criticism, a conception already amply illustrated both in argument and example, and lately reinforced by two volumes of exceptional interest.

Examining an opinion put forward by Mr. T. S. Eliot that there are three kinds of criticism—the historical, the philosophic, and the purely literary—Mr. Middleton Murry has little difficulty in showing that the critic who wishes to find in literature only a manifestation of evolutionary process is no critic at all, but ' a ' fragment of a social historian.' This topic, it may be mentioned in passing, is brilliantly treated by Benedetto Croce in the chapter of ' Nuovi Saggi di Estetica,' entitled ' La riforma ' della storia artistica e letteraria.' Specially incisive are Signor Croce's comments on the nationalistic literary histories of certain Germans and the sociological bee in Dr. Brandes' bonnet. The erudition and wide reading used without pedantry by Signor Croce in this and all other discussions, brings home to us the disadvantages of our English critics. Even the best of them is insular in his reading, and by the conditions in which he so often exercises his calling seems physically debarred from attaining that thorough grasp of European literature and contemporary comment upon it which is so patent a virtue in the great Italian.

Mr. Murry then proceeds, somewhat summarily, to show that the profession of philosophy as such is really no criterion, since Aristotle, whom both Mr. Eliot and he regard as the supreme literary critic, was as much a professional philosopher as Hegel or Croce, whom he regards as typical philosophic

critics. ' The difference depends,' Mr. Murry believes, ' upon ' the nature of the philosophy,' and he develops the view that the true literary critic must have a humanistic philosophy. ' His inquiries must be modulated, subject to an intimate, ' organic governance, by an ideal of the good life.'

This is a dogmatic assertion with vast implications, exposed to all kinds of misunderstanding. Mr. Murry will have to spend a great deal more time and thought if he wishes to make his conceptions unmistakably clear. Benedetto Croce has found it necessary to devote a life to proving and illustrating his conviction that true criticism of art can only be based on a true and complete philosophy. The aesthetic interest, as Professor Wildon Carr points out in his very clear exposition of Croce's philosophy, was with him the primary impulse. To what heights and broad surveys it has led him, the body of his work magnificently shows. Philosophy cannot be treated summarily ; it is something far different from the aesthetic vision, and requires all the intellectual penetration and patience of which a man is capable. On almost every line of the five pages in which Mr. Murry puts forward his philosophy of art, objections and demands for explanation arise like dust behind the wheels of his eager chariot. If he wishes to be convincing, he cannot leave that dust in suspension : he has got to lay it, especially if some of it is still in his own mind.

' Nothing is precious,' he says ' because it is true, save to a ' mind which has, consciously or unconsciously, decided that it ' is good to know the truth.' The objection is obvious : truth and goodness, it has been held, are independent categories, though both equally *desirable* as ideals. To lay objections like this, once he has raised them, Mr. Murry is surely driven, as was Benedetto Croce, to examine the whole activity of mind and the reality in which it is manifested. Again, ' An ideal of a good ' life, if it is to have the internal coherence and organic force of a ' true ideal, *must inevitably be aesthetic*.' Italics are not so convincing as proof. Aristotle's ideal of a good life as exposed in the ' Ethics,' a much profounder book than the ' Poetics,' was not aesthetic, nor was Kant's categorical imperative. Once more, Mr. Murry asserts that the examination of the identity which Plato established between the good and the beautiful is ' labour ' lost, for that identity is axiomatic, absolute, irreducible.' A

high-strung emotion is, no doubt, responsible for this forcible statement, for Mr. Murry is a poet: but a reasonable reply is that things called by different names cannot be identical in an absolute sense. Mr. Murry must explain: the only cogency in these matters is logical, not emotional, and it is precisely here that criticism differs from artistic creation. The critic, as Signor Croce points out, is 'philosophus additus artifici,' and must proceed by methods suitable to the philosopher.

Mr. Murry, I am convinced, is so fundamentally right both in his practice as a critic and in his intentions, that the demand for the utmost clarity in his conceptions is all the more imperative.

'True criticism is itself an organic part of the whole activity of art; it is the exercise of sovereignty by art upon itself, and not the imposition of an alien. To use our previous metaphor, as art is the consciousness of life, criticism is the consciousness of art. . . . .'

'What distinguishes the true critic of poetry is a truly aesthetic philosophy.'

'The poet who would be a critic has to make his aesthetic philosophy conscious to himself; to him as a poet it may be unconscious.'

'Art is autonomous, and to be pursued for its own sake, precisely because it comprehends the whole of human life; because it has reference to a more perfectly human morality than any other activity of man; because in so far as it is truly art, it is indicative of a more comprehensive and unchallengeable harmony in the spirit of man.'

'Art reveals to us the principle of its own governance. The function of criticism is to apply it.'

No genuine critic—certainly not Benedetto Croce—could take exception to the view of art and criticism expressed in most of these sentences. The intended relation of art to morality needs further elucidation, and an honest examination by Mr. Murry of his own soul lest he be led to universal propositions by certain momentary spiritual needs of his own. How, one is bound to ask, does he safeguard himself from a false moralistic criterion of art, by which the degree of edification, not the keenness of the vision, is the criterion of praise?

The critic's first duty, Mr. Murry rightly insists, is to place himself in the most intimate contact with the work of art, in order that he may decide whether it is organic and living. In other words, he has first to recreate for himself as far as possible the artistic vision, and then to judge of its perfection as a vision. Mr. Murry, however, lays a further function on the critic.

He assigns to him not merely the right, but the duty of judging between all artists whose work is known, and deciding their places in the vast hierarchy of art. One objection arises here: is this anything but a counsel of unattainable perfection? What human being can have that first requisite, a perfect comprehension, equally of Homer and Shakespeare, Dante and Milton? Without an equally perfect comprehension the just comparison cannot be established. Mr. Murry may be bold enough to assert that he can appreciate Homer as fully as Shakespeare, Dante as fully as Milton, Tchehov (whom he reads in English) as well as Thomas Hardy; Signor Croce, with all his penetration, is not so bold. It is enough, Croce holds, for one man to understand a few artists perfectly; history, which he regards as the most complete representation of concrete and indivisible reality, achieves this ultimate grading in its slow process. Further, Signor Croce insists, with patient argument, not mere assertion, that the artistic expression (by which he means the vision in the artistic mind) is unique and incomparable. So far as it is considered purely as an artistic creation, beauty is the only category applicable to it, and where beauty has been perfectly achieved in different ways, as in Ariosto's harmonious octaves or Dante's passionate rhymes, there is no possibility of comparison without leaving out those very quintessential qualities which make the artistic creation of Ariosto and Dante exactly what they are. The critic is more than a taster, but even as taster, it may be suggested, he cannot properly compare a vintage wine with a growth of tea.

The 'Nuovi Saggi di Estetica' is a volume of great importance on the aesthetic side of Benedetto Croce's philosophy. In his preface he compares his early volume, the 'Estetica,' to a process of weeding and sowing, and the 'Nuovi Saggi' to the fruitful bearing of a better seed. In England we have judged Croce far too much by the 'Estetica' alone, largely owing to our dependence on translations where the Italian language is concerned. It is therefore much to be hoped that Mr. Douglas Ainslie will before long publish a complete translation of this volume, one chapter at least of which he has already translated.* Sides of Croce's

* 'Contemporary Review,' October, 1920. 'Literary Criticism as Philosophy.'

aesthetic philosophy which were crude and undeveloped are here brought to ripeness and amplified, particularly in the four lectures of the ' Breviario di Estetica ' with which the book opens, and in the three chapters entitled ' The Reform of the History ' of Art and Literature,' ' Literary criticism as Philosophy,' and ' Some critical maxims and their true meaning.' It is impossible to gain a just notion of Signor Croce's theory of art and criticism without considering his philosophy as a whole. He is a writer of intense conviction and incisive style, who is apt to state a view in an uncompromising manner, proceeding always with a rigorous logic, and many a reader, outraged at being dragged along in quite so brusque a manner, feels a strong desire to jib. But where Signor Croce is most incisive he has usually a false theory in view, and it is always necessary to remember that where his aim is constructive his theories are stated in a more persuasive and comprehensive manner.

To ordinary moralistic conceptions of art and criticism based upon a moral criterion, Signor Croce is a ruthless enemy. He sees in them not only erroneous logic, but the death of art. He hates them as vigorously as he hates purely impressionistic, hedonistic, pseudo-historical, and all other kinds of false criticism against which he so energetically tilts. The artist, he holds, is and must be concerned with beauty alone, for art is autonomous, a vision of reality logically prior to all moral distinctions. Mr. Murry, having got so far as this, protests : he protests too soon. No manifestation of the mind or spirit lies outside the scope of poetry, as Croce conceives it. The great poet can use the loftiest thought, the highest aspirations, the most intense moral convictions, but he uses them by throwing them into the crucible of his mind, and recasting them in the artistic vision.

Signor Croce's view of a critic's function and usefulness is illustrated in every chapter of the ' Nuovi Saggi,' but the last section of the ' Breviario di Estetica ' entitled ' La Critica e la ' storia dell'arte ' contains his most direct statement. He begins by giving full weight to current criticisms of the critic, who is seen as the tyrannous pedagogue, the judge of already decided causes, or the mere amiable ' cicerone ' and interpreter. Well, says Signor Croce, there is truth in all these views. The pedagogue who arbitrarily sets up one form of art against another must himself have some experience of the artistic impulse ;

critical judgment is another word for taste ; interpretation rests on knowledge. These three things—artistic experience, taste and knowledge—a critic must have, yet they are not criticism, but only its antecedents. By their help the critic does no more than fulfil his primary duty, to place himself at the artist's point of view. His own contribution is that of thought, by which alone he comes, even if he be poet himself, to full consciousness of art.

If he is unsparing, in the name of art, to inferior artists, as he has lately been to the Italian poet Pascoli, against false criticism he shows himself absolutely ruthless. In three spirited pages of the ' Breviario ' he lashes all his bugbears—the critic who, instead of recreating and judging, chops up and classifies ; the moralistic critic whose criterion is the degree of edification ; the hedonistic critic, who inquires what pleasure has been produced ; the intellectualist, who ' knows Dante's philosophy ' but not his passion ' ; the psychological critic, who tries to tear the content from the form, delving into the artist's creation for biographical evidence ; the formalist, who strips form from content ; the precious euphuist, who finds beauty only in luscious ornament ; or the pedant who, having fixed the generic laws of the arts, judges particular expressions by their approximation to Procrustean standards. Still more than these he hates the ' pseudo-aesthetic,' and the ' pseudo-historical ' critics, the one all rapture, the other all research. Let them at least, he cries, stick to their professions. Let the aesthetics, when they must, communicate by signs, ' their features unconsciously shaped for ' rapture, their arms outstretched in the gesture of admiration, ' or their hands joined in a thanksgiving for joy received ' ; and let the ' storicisti ' talk of codices, corrections, dates, sources, syntax, and metre as much as they please, but not of art, to whom they stand merely as a humble handmaid before the mistress whose clothes she brushes.

Criticism then, is neither a swoon of ecstasy, nor a religious exercise, nor a mortification of the spirit, nor a mechanical grubbing up of documentary irrelevances : it is the live work of a live mind. There is only one art, and one criticism alone. The aim of criticism is aesthetic, but its result is history, for it is the full account of an artistic fact. ' La vera e compiuta critica ' è la serena narrazione storica di ciò che è accaduto.' There is

no imaginative or intellectual power in this high conception of the critical function, which lies outside the necessary equipment of a worthy critic of letters ; but his aim must be straight if he is to make proper use of these powers. He must not be misled by his emotions into trying to sing the poet's tune in other words : to such efforts Signor Croce humorously applies the notice in German concert halls—*Das Mitsingen ist verboten.* His intellectual interest must not tempt him to drag philosophical content out of its context, or his zeal for knowledge let him substitute for the account of an artist the biographical portrait of a man or the pathological reconstruction of a consciousness. Facts and emotions all have their usefulness, but the art of an artist is the sole subject of a critic, for the artist himself has put into it all the history and biography that he required. It is not the work of art itself which needs to be visibly reconstructed in words, but the essential feeling (' sentimento ') which is its inner flame, and, so far as the artist is concerned, it is the aesthetic, not the historical personality, which it is the critic's task to illuminate.

So lofty a justification of the critical function, and so firm a basing of its principles are the work of a great and penetrating mind. Even Doctor Bosanquet, whose objections on some points are strong, says of Croce's aesthetic theory in general :—

> ' It does justice to all the essential qualities of the beautiful ; to its spirituality and its simplicity. Wherever, it says, you find vision and utterance, there you have art and beauty. They may be on a great scale or a small, but they have one quality throughout. It is a real service for a man to have thrown the whole weight of his conviction into this principle, and through it to have asserted aesthetic theory as a plain and human thing, disembarrassed of traditional lumber, and addressed directly to the central interest of all who care for beauty.'

It may be said with equal truth that Croce does justice to all the essential qualities of criticism. His latest volume, ' Ariosto, ' Shakespeare and Corneille,' demands translation, both as a lesson in literary criticism by a master, and as containing a profound study of our greatest poet.

Signor Croce never claims to say everything or to say the last word ; for him there is no last word either in philosophy or criticism : but his claim is to clear away ' traditional lumber ' and to get at the central interest which has already commended

itself to lovers of beauty. To reveal it and to illuminate it, to show its rise and its culmination, to distinguish between its perfect manifestations and those less perfect—these are the tasks to which he girds himself as a critic. The brief criticism of former criticism with which he sets out, if pungent, is amazing for its wide grasp and the skill with which he moves through the vast literature surrounding his subjects. In the first and fifth chapters of the 'Shakespeare,' Signor Croce clears his way like one of Ariosto's knights through a Saracen host, with a shrewd blow here, a head lopped off there, a dunce transfixed on the right, a pedant lamed on the left, ever and anon slipping aside to let contending critical theories chop at one another. Praising the best of our English critics, Coleridge, Dowden, Raleigh and Bradley, he falls upon Brandes, jostles Frank Harris aside, treads upon Taine and Voltaire, and knocks over rows of ponderous German men-at-arms like ninepins. All this he does in the spirit, the death of which Dryden himself deplored, as a 'defender 'of poets' and of art against ill-based criticism and the accumulations of misdirected industry.

The chapter in which, having cleared the ground, Signor Croce makes for the 'sentimento Shakespeariano' is a work of art, and cannot be reproduced in other words. It makes clear with acute penetration and—what is still more convincing—invariable good sense, the special quality of our poet which brings not only poets, intellectuals and critics, but all men under his spell. Shakespeare, he says, is not a poet of particular passions or particular ideals: what attracted him so powerfully was life itself with all its chances and changes, its struggles, victories and defeats. Nothing within the compass of human experience is out of his range, but he does not seek to go beyond his vivid vision of life: he explains nothing, he reconciles nothing. Ariosto, who veiled all the sharp colours of life in his divine irony, attained thereby the peculiar harmony which is his poetical essence. Shakespeare, by giving to all the passions that he represents an equal vigour and an equal relief, attains through their reciprocal tension an equilibrium of another kind.

It is palpably erroneous to stamp Shakespeare as a man dominated by the ideas of the Reformation, as a pagan, or as a sceptic: he was none of these because he was a poet with a gaze

fixed on human life itself, in which these and other attitudes of mind were only some among many elements. In relation to the life of his time, Shakespeare truly represents the man of the Renaissance. The sympathy and penetration with which Signor Croce unfolds the wonderful volume from the comedies of love to the most complex tragedies of the will is profound: the passage on Falstaff—that so essentially English character—would alone be sufficient proof of his mastery. The best of our English critics have already done for us what Signor Croce has primarily done for his own countrymen, yet Englishmen are few to whom this excursion in the companionship of the Italian critic would not bring pleasure, new light and refreshment. We shall burn with him when in the chapter 'L'arte dello 'Shakespeare' he turns upon those who have denied Shakespeare the name of artist, and, at the end, many of us will sympathize with him when he says sadly that, in spite of all its minute investigation and philological apparatus, the present age does not appreciate Shakespeare with that 'intimate thrill of the 'spirit' which was more lively in the days of less research and less accurate texts.

ORLO WILLIAMS.

D'ANNUNZIO'S LYRIC POETRY

1. Primo Vere, 1879; Canto Nuovo, 1882; Intermezzo di Rime, 1883; Isaotta Guttadauro ed altre poesie, 1886; L'Isotteo-La Chimera, 1890; Le Elegie Romane, 1892; Poema Paradisiaco e Odi Navali, 1893; La Canzone di Garibaldi, 1901; Laudi del Cielo, del Mare, della Terra e degli Eroi, Vol. I., Maia-Laus Vitae, Vol. II., Elettra, 1903-4, Vol. III., Alcione, 1907, Vol. IV., Merope-Le Canzoni della Gesta d'Oltremare, 1912; La Canzone del Quarnaro, 1918; Cantico per l'Ottava della Vittoria, 1918.

2. Gabriele D'Annunzio. By ALFREDO GARGIULO. Naples: Perrella. 1912.

THE art and the life of Gabriele D'Annunzio are so inextricably woven into a single whole that one shrinks from partitioning them off into water-tight compartments, from trying to discuss the poet apart from the novelist or the dramatist, or even from the adventurer and soldier. But if any section of D'Annunzio's work can be adequately treated in this way, it is his poetry; for he is above all things a great lyric poet, and it is with his poetry that all consideration of his art must begin and end. His prose is a poet's prose, and those who, like Signor Giovanni Papini, look for such pedestrian qualities as lucidity and precision, have turned from its 'odious perfection' in disgust. Yet were it not for his novels, and to a less extent for his tragedies, D'Annunzio would, like Carducci, be little more than a name outside Italy. Indeed, it is astonishing how many of his admirers have not read even the prose 'Contemplazione della Morte,' much less 'Alcione.' Poetry cannot be translated, as Johnson pointed out. It is the poets who preserve languages; 'for we 'would not be at the trouble to learn a language, if we could 'have all that is written in it just as well in translations.' And unquestionably the best of D'Annunzio is to be found in his poetry.

D'Annunzio's promise was at once recognized in his first volume, 'Primo Vere,' published when he was only sixteen. He was then still in the imitative stage. The 'Canto Nuovo' first displays him in full possession of his powers, firmly established upon his own feet. The book struck a new note in Italy. Here we have the healthy child of nature on the threshold

of manhood, revelling in the glory of his youth and strength, and living the simple country life of his own wild Abruzzi.

> ' L' immensa gioia di vivere,
> d'essere forte, d'essere giovine,
> di mordere i frutti terrestri
> con saldi e bianchi denti voraci ;
> di por le mani audaci e cupide
> su ogni dolce cosa tangibile,
> di tendere l'arco su ogni
> preda novella che il desio miri.'

These early lines might serve as a motto not merely for the ' Canto Nuovo,' but for the whole of D'Annunzio's later life and work. So close is he living to nature that he hardly conceives himself apart from it.

> ' Ignudo le membra agilissime a'l sole ed a l'acqua
> liberamente, come un bianco cefalo
> nuota, fiutando ne l'aura lascivia di muschio
> che da' salci a onde spargon le cerabmici.'

Already it is clear that D'Annunzio's outlook on the world is sensuous. As with Pater's Marius ' all influences reached him, ' even more exclusively than he was aware, through the medium ' of sense.' Though the metres are still the classical metres of Carducci, sapphics, alcaics or elegiacs, the ' coppia di serpentelli ' alati,' the poet has assimilated them and made them his own, as he has assimilated the quantities of other material he was to borrow during his long career. For a sensualist like D'Annunzio, with no inspiring faith or rich inner life to draw upon, is bound to be largely dependent upon external influences, for his inspiration.

With all its excellence the ' Canto Nuovo ' is the work of a boy. The poet's experience had to be deepened and widened by a fuller draught at the fountain of life before it could reach maturity. Rome was to be his school. Here his extraordinary susceptibility to sensuous beauty of every kind was quickened by close familiarity with the art treasures of the capital. But it was medieval rather than classical Rome that attracted him, the Renaissance Rome of the Popes, with its gardens and palaces. Like the hero of his novel, ' Il Piacere,' he would have given the Arch of Titus for the Fontana delle Tartarughe. Here, too, he threw himself eagerly into the life of pleasure that opened

before him. Art seems to have superseded nature as the dominating influence of his life. His rich, gorgeous style begins to attain maturity—a style which has since become part of himself. Words now possess for him the attraction of beautiful jewels, quite apart from their meaning. Indeed, he compares himself to a master-goldsmith of Florence. Above all, there is a deepening of the lyric melancholy, of the haunting sense of decay, suggesting the falling leaves of autumn, which is so characteristic of his writings, once the brief moment of rapturous enjoyment is over.

D'Annunzio's energies now found a fuller outlet in his novels and tragedies than in his poetry. The poems which followed 'Canto Nuovo' were a disappointment to admirers of that early work. Yet one is forced to admit, as Renato Serra puts it, that D'Annunzio cannot be commonplace. He can be dull, false, even to some extent detestable, but it is always in a way of his own. A moment of apparently unrelieved decadence and insincerity may coincide with a moment of the highest lyrical inspiration. The decadent beauty of many of the lyrics in the 'Poema Paradisiaco,' for instance, or the 'Intermezzo di Rime' is unsurpassed of its kind.

When Rome is his subject this child of the primitive Abruzzi proves himself no stepson of the city of his adoption. In the 'Elegie Romane' we have the poetical counterpart to the admirable descriptions of Rome in 'Il Piacere.' Among the best of them are 'Villa Medici,' the two on St. Peter's, and 'Dal Monte Pincio.'

'Sorge lavato il monte, fragrante di fresca verdura,
trepido ; e il ciel di maggio ride alla rotta nube.

Pace nell'aria viene dal bel lacrimevole riso,
cui vaga pur d'altezza l'anima nostra attinge,

cui balenando in cima le cupole attingono e gli alti
alberi che gran serto fanno a'tuoi colli, o Roma.

Mite risplendi, o Roma. Cerulea sotto l'azzurro,
tutta ravvolta in velo tenue d'oro, giaci. . . .'

D'Annunzio has been called the poet of places and many beautiful pictures of cities may be found scattered up and down his works. The long series of sonnets in the 'Città di Silenzio,' in the second volume of the 'Laudi,' naturally vary

in quality. None of them quite equals the three opening poems to Ferrara and Ravenna, and more especially this to Pisa :

' Quale una donna presso il davanzale,
socchiusa i cigli, tiepida nella sua vesta
di biondo lino,
che non è desta, ed il suo sogno muore :
tale su le bell'acque pallido sorride
il tuo sopore.
E i santi marmi ascendono leggeri,
quasi lungi da te, come se gli echi
li animassero d'anime canore.'

Now, too, the life of pleasure begins to become prominent, not merely in its joys, but in the nauseating disgust it inspires, as in the well-known sonnet in the ' Intermezzo di Rime,' with its Petrarchan ring, in which he bewails how

' la giovinezza mia barbara e forte
in braccio de le femmine si uccide.'

The pictures of women are as varied as they are vivid. He seems always conscious of the subtle temptation of their hands, trailing in the water or resting idly on marble balustrades.

' Le mani delle donne che incontrammo
una volta nel sogno, o ne la vita :
oh quelle mani, Anima, quelle dita
che stringemmo una volta, che sfiorammo
con le labbra, e nel sogno, e nella vita.'

And there are descriptions such as this :—

' Ergesi il corpo d'Ebe, quale un' anfora,
da la mia stretta ; e l'avide
mani ella tende al ramo, in attitudine
bellissima, ed ai cubiti

mudati le sorridono due rosei
cavi, due nidi rosei,
ove, meglio che a'l frutto, io vorrei mordere.'

The ' Laus Vitae,' which forms the first volume of the ' Laudi del Cielo, del Mare, della Terra e degli Eroi,' is much the longest poem D'Annunzio has yet written. An Italian once told the writer that a holiday in Greece first enabled him, brought up as he had been in the heart of Rome, to realize what a visit to Italy means to an Englishman. Certainly D'Annunzio's trip to Greece seems to have acted as a wonderful spur to his poetic

imagination. The 'Laus Vitae' is a hymn to life in all its aspects. His soul has lived like ten thousand.

'Tutto fu ambito
e tutto fu tentato.
Quel che non fu fatto
io lo sognai;
e tanto era l'ardore
che il sogno eguagliò l'atto.'

The poem was written in a prolonged burst of inspiration, but it is uneven. The best of it is to be found in single passages rather than in the organic whole, notably in the earlier books, which are directly inspired by his experiences in Greece. Particularly fine is the meeting with Ulysses, the Ulysses of Dante rather than of Homer, symbol of the solitary wanderers and adventurers, to whose ranks D'Annunzio obviously belongs, as he turns scornfully from the poet's prayer on his lonely ship in the Aegean.

The 'Laus Vitae' is full of interesting passages of self-revelation.

'Felicità, non ti cercai;
che soltanto cercai me stesso,
me stesso e la terra lontana.'

At Olympia he recognizes Hippodamia, the mother of Atreus, and all his incestuous house, as the symbol of much of his own art:—

'L'aspetto sublime
dell' Ombra cui l'arte m'è fisa
in te raffiguro, Ippodàmia.'

In the prayer to Zeus he confesses his loathing of the monsters of sensuality that drag him down; and the god's answer explains not a little in the poet's work:—

'Combattere e vincere i mostri
non ti varrà sulla Terra,
se trasfigurarli non sai,
Aedo, in fanciulli divini.'

In the prayer to Hermes, D'Annunzio sets himself to sing the achievements of modern man, such as the railway and the telegraph. But here he is less successful, as in his pilgrimage through a great city. To him it is all horrible. Signor Gargiulo

well observes that he is singing his own loathing of the monsters of sensuality that devour him rather than the sorrows of mankind. An aristocrat at heart, he would always have hated the mob, even were he not still dominated by Nietsche's Superman.

> ' Per vincere il disgusto
> respirai l'aria infetta,
> il fetore del fiato
> plebeo, l'afa della carogna.'

And he vents his truly Italian power of vituperation upon the ' great demagogue.' This is hardly the note of the born singer of the industrial world of our day. The kind of perverted attraction which the vice and misery of modern Rome exercise upon a passionate devotee of aesthetic beauty like D'Annunzio finds a better outlet in the well-known picture of Helen as the ' meretrice ' di Pirgo.' The reader fully shares the poet's joy in the freshness of the scent of the asphodels and of the pine-woods that reaches him from the open country beyond, while the lines on the Sistine Chapel are symbolical of the real debt he owes to Rome, the city of cities to him. ' Morire o gioire ' is as much D'Annunzio's gospel as the ' navigare necesse est, vivere non est necesse,' which is the motto of the whole poem.

It is not mere idle curiosity that sets us wondering how ' Alcione,' the third volume of the ' Laudi,' came to be written. It would be of real value to learn something of the circumstances that helped to establish the almost perfect balance in the powers of a personality so interesting as D'Annunzio, which enabled him to produce what is undoubtedly his masterpiece in a volume of lyrics written when he was well over forty. Here he returns to the theme of the ' Canto Nuovo.' Nature, which had inspired the best work of the stripling poet, was to carry the man to his highest achievement.

> ' Natura ed Arte sono un dio bifronte
> che conduce il tuo passo armonioso
> per tutti i campi della Terra pura.'

In the ' Canto Nuovo ' he had prayed in vain that a dryad might break from the bark of the tree, but now he can call her forth and endow her with life himself in ' Versilia,' where the wood-nymph appears to woo the man who is eating a peach beneath the shade of her tree.

' Io sono divina ; e tu forse
mi piaci. Non piacquemi l'irto
Satiro su'l letto di mirto,
e il panisco in van mi rincorse.

Ma tu forse mi piaci. Aulisce
d'acqua marina la tua pelle
che il Sol feceti fosca. Snelle
hai gambe come bronzo lisce. . . .

Guarda : ho i denti eguali, più bianchi
che appena sbucciati pinocchi.
Non temere, o uomo dagli occhi
glauchi ! Rido, se tu m' abbranchi.

Abbrancami come il bicorne
villoso. La frasca ci copra,
i mirti sien letto, di sopra
ci pendano l'albe viorne.

Ma come, Occhiazzurro, sei cauto !
Forse amico sei di Diana ? '

Perhaps the most popular of these modern myths, more popular even than ' L'Otre,' is ' La Morte del Cervo,' in which the poet, couched among the reeds waiting for the stag at evening, sees a human form swimming the Serchio ; not till it leaves the river does he realize that it has four hoofs, and is the Centaur.

' Ritondo il capo avea, tutto di ricci
folto come la vite di racimoli ;
e l'inclinava a mordicare i cimoli
dei ramicelli, i teneri viticci

con la gran bocca usa alla vettovoglia
sanguinolenta, a tritar gli ossi, a bere
d'un fiato il vin fumoso nel cratere
ampio, sopra le mense di Tessaglia.

Levava il braccio umano, dal bicipite
guizzante, a côrre il ramicel d'un pioppo.'

The admirable description of the fight between the Centaur and the stag must be read in the original. Possibly the idea was suggested by the horse the poet was using at this time, which was called Folo.

These anthropomorphic myths are the greatest triumph of D'Annunzio's art. They give him a unique place among modern poets. He himself in an interview many years earlier had said :—

'Anthropomorphism is not dead, though it has been as it were spiritualized. Never has the human soul had deeper communion with the soul of things. Things are merely the symbols of our feelings, helping us to discover the mystery that lies hidden in each one of us.'

Why is it that it has been given to D'Annunzio to breathe a new life into anthropomorphic mythology? To our mind it is because nature appeals to him entirely through the senses, because his outlook and his whole art are aesthetic and sensuous rather than spiritual. His attitude towards nature in 'Alcione' does not differ from his attitude in the 'Canto Nuovo.' But in 'Alcione' he endows nature with human qualities by making natural objects share the sensual life of man.

D'Annunzio does not, like Wordsworth, regard nature as a separate individual force, altogether distinct from man. For Wordsworth, the joy and sorrow of nature are independent of human emotions. He 'only gathers up the spiritual influences 'which emanate from a stream or a mountain into a living 'centre.' Yet it is through nature alone that there can be inter-communion between all things.

> 'Love from heart to heart is stealing,
> from earth to man, from man to earth.'

In 'L'Onda,' perhaps the best known of all D'Annunzio's poems, there is no attempt at anthropomorphism. He brings the wave before us as it plashes on the shore not merely in every aspect that can be apprehended by our senses, above all in its sound and colour, but in the joy it takes in its life and movement. He seems, however, to emotionalize rather than to spiritualize it. He comes nearer to spiritualizing the landscape in others of the nature poems contained in this volume, poems in which the haunting beauty of the 'Elegie Romane' is raised to its highest power, such as 'Lungo L'Affrico nella Sera di Giugno' or 'Bocca d'Arno' or 'Beatitudine.'

> '"Color di perla quasi informa, quale
> conviene a donna aver, non fuor misura."
> Non è, Dante, tua donna che in figura
> della rorida Sera a noi discende?
> Non è non è dal cielo Beatrice
> discesa in terra a noi
> bagnata il viso di pianto d'amore?'

And 'color di perla' runs through a group of summer evening poems like a musical *motif* binding them together just as 'Settembre' binds a later group. For they can be divided into summer and autumn poems—a division which holds good in most of D'Annunzio's art, alternating as it does between eager enjoyment and nauseating satiety. Nature is most truly spiritualized, almost moralized, in this passage from 'L'Ulivo.'

'O dolce Luce, gioventù dell'aria,
giustizia incorruttibile, divina
nudità delle cose, o Animatrice,
in noi discendi!

Tocca l'anima nostra come tocchi
il casto ulivo in tutte le sue foglie;
e non sia parte in lei che tu non veda,
Omniveggente!'

Poems such as 'Beatitudine' or 'Stabat Nuda Aestas' form the connecting link between these landscapes and D'Annunzio's myths, in which he never for a moment loses sight of the natural object in the human personality he gives it. Thus Daphne's beauty clothes the earth, her tender limbs are mountains and valleys and woods.

'Il suo sguardo inzaffira gli orizzonti,
la sua chioma fa l'oro dell' estate.'

But though 'Alcione' is undoubtedly D'Annunzio's highest achievement, it was the fourth volume of the 'Laudi,' the 'Canzoni della Gesta d'Oltremare,' inspired by the Tripoli campaign, that gave him his place in the hearts of his countrymen. There has, of course, been the usual wearisome discussion as to their sincerity or insincerity. Rhetorical they are, as such poetry is bound to be, but they are not mere rhetoric. To our mind there cannot be two opinions as to the genuine character of the feeling that inspires them. The poet's love for Italy is not of the purest kind. It lacks the lofty idealism of a Leopardi or a Carducci, and it is tainted with the individualism of the Renaissance adventurer. Indeed, it is not always easy to draw the line between D'Annunzio's patriotism and his thirst for personal glory. But these 'Canzoni della Gesta d'Oltremare' breathe the joy of a loyal Italian, who has lived through the long years of disillusion that followed the capture of Rome, at

seeing Italy at last united in a great enterprise of conquest. D'Annunzio could only be an Imperialist. And it is not strange that a poet so deeply imbued with the spirit of the Renaissance should dream of a restoration of the empire of Venice in the Adriatic. This imperialism is out of date ; D'Annunzio belongs to the world before the war, and he has ceased to be an active influence among the new generation of men of letters. But the Canzoni do not seem to us to ring false. They certainly mark a great advance on the ' Odi Navali ' or the rather dreary Garibaldi poems.

The ' Canzoni della Gesta d'Oltremare ' were written in exile in France. During the European war, D'Annunzio's energies were unsparingly devoted to the cause he had at heart. But once at least the ' ex-poeta,' as his detractors delight to call him, successfully turned his fighting experiences into splendid poetry, in the ' Canzone del Quarnaro.' ' A fighting man ' among fighting men,' as he proudly declares, he himself took part in the daring raid of the Italian torpedo-boats on Buccari, almost a suburb of Fiume, where he had hitherto been only on a ship of words, he tells us, referring to his tragedy of ' La Nave.' And the quality of this fine naval ballad is beyond dispute.

The ' Cantico per l'Ottava della Vittoria ' is not one of D'Annunzio's best poems, but it is interesting because it gives expression to the mysticism which he owes to the war, and which has been duly labelled false by many Italian critics. In death he sees the great leveller. The individual killed in battle is mingled with the spirit of the race, which thus transfigures the humblest in a vision of glory. In this sense, and in this sense only, he recognizes the humblest soldier of the ranks as his brother.

' Patria ! Patria ! Questa sola parola è tutto il cielo.'

LACY COLLISON-MORLEY.

GREECE, CONSTANTINE AND VENIZELOS

1. The Turks in Europe. By W. E. D. Allen. John Murray. 1919.
2. The Truth about Greece. By G. F. Abbott. The Voice of Greece. 1917.
3. Constantine I. and the Greek People. By Paxton Hibben. New York The Century Co. 1920.
4. Constantine, King and Traitor. By Mrs. Kenneth Brown. John Lane. 1918.
5. Tales of Ægean Intrigue. By J. C. Lawson. Chatto & Windus. 1920
6. Documents Diplomatiques, 1913-1917. 2 Vols. ("Greek White Book.") Athens: Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 1917.
7. The Vindication of Greek National Policy, 1912-1917: Report of Debates in the Greek Chamber, August, 1917. Allen & Unwin. 1918.

THE restoration of King Constantine to the Greek throne has provided another surprise for those who have time to consider the affairs of the Near East.

'For a year and a half (says Mr. H. G. Wells in his 'Outline of 'History') the Greek King, the brother-in-law of the Kaiser, being protected by friends in high quarters on the Allied side, tricked and misled the Allies, and wasted the lives of great numbers of common British and French soldiers. In June 1917 he was forced to abdicate, but instead of permitting the Greeks, under their proper leader, Venizelos, to follow their natural and proper republican disposition, his son Alexander, the Kaiser's nephew, was made king in his place—*by the Allies!* This Greek chapter in the story of the great war still awaits the investigations of the historians; it is at present a quite inexplicable story.'

The historian, however, will find very little mystery about Constantine. What is almost inexplicable is the attitude of his defenders, who persist in assuring us that he was always pathetically anxious to be allowed to help in defeating his brother-in-law. Mr. G. F. Abbott in the *Nation* of November 27, 1920 and Vice-Admiral Mark Kerr in the *Morning Post* of December 11 and 13, 1920 indignantly denounce 'the legend of his pro-Germanism.' One example of the Constantinian defence as there presented will suffice. It is asserted that King Constantine did not desert the Serbians, and break the Greco-Serbian Treaty of May 19, 1913 by refusing to go to the assistance of the Serbians when

Bulgaria entered the war in October 1915, because Serbia had in fact already denounced the treaty by refusing to go to the assistance of Greece when Turkey threatened Greece in June 1913.

There are two interesting points to be observed about this argument. The first is that it had not been thought of in October 1915, for it is not referred to in the Greek reply to Serbia's appeal,* and first made its appearance in 1917 in Mr. Abbott's euphemistically named pamphlet 'The Truth about Greece,' whence it is repeated by Vice-Admiral Mark Kerr. The next is that it is not true; for when we turn to the documents of the Greco-Serbian negotiations of 1914,† we find that Serbia did *not* refuse to intervene in the very strained situation between Greece and Turkey, but merely pointed out that a fresh outbreak of war was for obvious military and financial reasons extremely undesirable; and not only did Serbia not refuse to assist her ally, but she used the strongest language to the Grand Vizier at Constantinople in order to bluff him into thinking that she was perfectly ready to declare war in defence of Greek interests; and at the same time she begged the other powers to use their influence to modify the provocative attitude of the Turks. These diplomatic measures were so successful that on June 22, 1914 Mr. Streit, himself now King Constantine's private adviser, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, telegraphed to Belgrade 'the lively 'gratitude of the Greek Government for the Serbian *démarche* at 'Constantinople on the subject of the persecution of Greeks in 'Turkey, a *démarche* which has proved once again the solidarity 'of our alliance, and the bonds of affection which unite the two 'peoples.'

It only remains to compare the Serbian attitude with that of King Constantine who, before refusing the Serbian appeal for armed assistance in October 1915, had deliberately thrown away the weapon of diplomatic bluff by secretly informing Germany and the Bulgarian minister Pazarov that he intended at all costs to remain neutral, even in the event of a Bulgarian attack on Serbia.‡ It is on the strength of such arguments as this which

---

* 'Greek White Book I.' No. 34; telegram of M. Zaimis to the Greek Minister at Nish, October 12, 1915. † 'Greek White Book II.' Nos. 1-5. ‡ 'Greek White Book I.' No. 30; *cf.* 'The Vindication of Greek National Policy,' pp. 97, 98; and Ἐλεύθερος Τύπος April 24, and May 7, 1920.

collapse as soon as they are inspected that King Constantine, through the mouths of Vice-Admiral Mark Kerr, Mr. G. F. Abbott and Mr. Paxton Hibben, an American journalist, now asks us to believe that he was not a pro-German. What is surprising is that Constantine's champions have not the wit to declare openly that he was a pro-German ; adding that he had, as a neutral monarch, a perfect right to be a pro-German if such were his inclinations, and also that if he was simple enough to believe that Germany was going to win it was actually his duty, as a patriotic Greek, to be a pro-German ! We are all inclined to forget in our attitude to the rest of Europe that in 1914 it was not an act of treachery to be a pro-German. In 1914 Constantine was a good-natured and a benevolent pro-German ; if by 1916 he had been converted by French pin-pricks and by German threats, and by his own inability to resist the logic of Venizelos by anything except pigheadedness and intrigue, into a sly and spiteful and dangerous pro-German, we must remember (this is how Vice-Admiral Mark Kerr should address us) that the licence of war is now over ; that it is to the credit of any ruler to have sincerely wished to save his people from the horrors of war ; and that he may make quite a good king, and may actually be devoted to the interests of the Greek people, in spite of the fact that he made a very unfortunate mistake in expecting and wishing Germany to win.

Of one thing we may be certain. Whatever the motives of the voters at the elections of November 14, the subsequent demand for the restoration of Constantine was essentially sentimental, and as such cannot be affected by all the logic of the historians. A crowd that cheers for a king ' over the water ' can never be silenced by the argument of his enemies or even by the inaccuracy of his friends.

The qualities that make a good general are not necessarily amiable. It matters little therefore whether Constantine deserves the military reputation which he acquired by his leadership of the Greek army during the two Balkan Wars ; perhaps he owed it entirely to the competence of his staff, to the newspapers, to the generosity of Venizelos, who was at that time particularly anxious to establish the popularity of the dynasty, or to his own undoubted capacity for sharing the life, the language and the jokes that appeal to soldiers in the field. He was, in Gibbon's phrase,

'doubtless a soldier and possibly a general'; and his prestige has been increased by some association with the idea of the reconquest of Constantinople, which, whatever its place in practical politics, will always remain a central thread in Greek tradition. When he acceded to the throne in 1913, under the lustre of Balkan victories, the story was widely spread that it was under the sovereignty of another Constantine that the Greeks were destined to regain the Byzantine capital which they had lost under Constantine Palaeologus. But the story seems to have been of modern invention; for in all the collections of Greek folk lore no story can be traced of the accession of another Constantine (whether accompanied or not by a consort with the auspicious name of Sofia), as the sign for the departure of the Turk from the city of Greek empire. The only old and widespread Greek tradition is to the effect that the Emperor Constantine Palaeologus himself was never killed in the Turkish assault on May 29, 1453, but was hidden away somewhere in the city by an angel and will reappear, like Arthur, when his time comes.* I do not think it has yet been suggested by the Athenian press that King Constantine is actually a reincarnation of Constantine Palaeologus; and it is therefore safe to assume that there is no element of folk lore in his popularity.

During the war Constantine strengthened his hold over his subjects by earning the half-grudging admiration which is accorded to those solitary leaders who, like De Wet in the Boer War, by trickery succeed in defying the irresistible might of a great Empire. It only remained for the Allies to top his slightly tarnished crown with the halo of martyrdom, and the portrait of the gallant and exiled monarch was then easily developed and beautified by a legion of loyal propagandists who received their instructions from Lucerne. There was no lack of money. Many of the wealthiest Greek ship owners were devotees of King Constantine, possibly for sentimental reasons, possibly because they were apprehensive of the Excess Profits Tax imposed by Venizelos. Prince Christopher, his brother, married an American millionairess, whose title and precedence would inevitably gain in definition when her brother-in-law's court was no longer confined to the sitting-room of a Swiss hotel. Finally, it is

* See N. G. Polites, Μελέται πέρι τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς γλώσσης τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ λαοῦ. Παραδόσεις. I. p. 33; II. p. 662.

alleged that the election chest of the opponents of M. Venizelos received large contributions from unnamed sources in Italy.

It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that Constantine was at the time of the elections the idol of a united populace. The government of Ralles and Gounares which succeeded that of Venizelos had naturally wished to spread the impression that the election of November 14 was the unprecedented display of a unanimous electorate in which hardly a single vote was cast for Venizelos. But it now appears that there were many abstentions—in Attica for example only 82,000 votes were recorded out of about 130,000 on the register—and that at least forty per cent. of the votes cast were for Venizelos. When it is realized that the sixty per cent. who voted against the Venizelist candidates must have included the solid Turkish and Jewish votes of the Salonica and Macedonian constituencies it becomes clear that Constantine's popularity was far from being universal : a conclusion which is also suggested by the fact that the result of the election (it is not denied) came as a complete surprise to both parties, as well as to all foreign observers ; only one young man at the British Legation is said to have foretold the actual result. After the election of course it only required the noisy enthusiasm of the winners and the silence of the defeated to give the newspaper correspondents the impression that ' the whole of Greece,' as one of them said, ' had gone mad for Tino.' And since the silent and bewildered Venizelists were deserted by their leaders, most of whom, with Venizelos himself, left the country immediately, it is hardly surprising that they made no sign of dissent to attract the attention of the delirious and armed crowds who were shouting for Constantine.

It was of course in order to exploit this polling-day enthusiasm and the timidity of their defeated opponents, and in order to convert a sixty per cent. vote against Venizelos into an unanimous vote for Constantine, that Ralles and Gounares insisted on holding an immediate plebiscite on the question of the return of Constantine ; and it was their perception of this trick which led the deputies of the Liberal (Venizelist) party who remained in Athens to issue on November 27 a manifesto declaring that the Liberal party loyally accepted the result of the election. They pointed out that nothing had happened since the election, at which a strong minority amounting to forty per cent. of the

electors had voted against the return of Constantine, to necessitate another consultation of popular opinion ; that a plebiscite on the return of Constantine carried out by a Government that had already recognized Constantine and was acting in his name could not be authoritative, as undue influence and ' moral violence ' would be exercised on all who voted ; and that the Government, which by means of a censorship of telegrams was keeping the people in ignorance of the international situation, must remain solely responsible for the consequences of Constantine's return. The plebiscite, it need hardly be added, was duly held on December 5 and showed a vote of 999,954 out of 1,013,724 in favour of Constantine ; no other candidates for the throne were allowed to be mentioned on the voting papers ; very few who were opposed to Constantine's return took the trouble or had the courage to vote, and those who voted for Constantine voted as often as they liked.

Finally, it must be noted that the candidates of the Liberal party were much more successful in the town than in the country constituencies. This holds good even of such a Gounarist stronghold as Patras, and accounts for the fact that before the election Venizelist demonstrations, naturally an urban spectacle, deceived the prophets. The Liberal party was swamped by the country voter : which suggests at once that the result of the election may have been the work of that part of the country which was least capable of appreciating the political issues involved, and may be regarded not so much as the expression of a conscious preference for Constantine, but rather as an outburst of discontent against the Venizelist administration.

The causes of the decline of Venizelos are less obvious and more interesting than the causes of Constantine's popularity. First of all it is a mistake to suppose, as English Liberals and Labour* gladly assume (the *Nation*, the *Daily News* and the *Daily Herald* are examples), that Venizelos is the imperialist who overreaches himself and collapses when he throws on the shoulders of his people responsibilities greater than they are willing to bear.

* Venizelos has in fact been criticised in Greece for his ' dangerously ' socialistic ' leanings. In this connection it should be noted that Greece was the first power to ratify the conventions of the Washington Labour Conference, that is ' to fulfil its obligations under the peace treaty so far as they relate to labour ' (*Times*, November 20, 1920).

Not one of his enemies has ever whispered that he has grasped at too much. The manifestos of the combined opposition may be searched in vain for any definite programme of foreign policy : and indeed since their success at the election the spokesmen of Constantine have been wearisome in their declarations that they will continue intact the foreign policy of their predecessor. We may look without success for any Greek to proclaim and develop the ideal of a little Greece which should be the university rather than the fortress of the Near East.

On the other hand Venizelos has been continually criticised for his moderation, his readiness to withdraw the Greek claims to Constantinople and Rhodes, his abandonment without the Smyrna pale of the pure-blooded Greeks of Pontus and Anatolia. The most brilliant of his enemies, the ill-fated Ion Dragoumis, who gave up to bad leading articles a style and a nobility of temperament that were meant for literature, has bitterly criticised him for being the most efficient and therefore the most pernicious of the politicians who have been content to add territorial sops to a little Athenian Kingdom, instead of proclaiming at once ' the great idea ' that Constantinople is the metropolis of the Greek nation. None of his critics has ever suggested a practical alternative to the policy of Venizelos, though they are never tired of explaining that they would have done the same things in a different way. During the war they called him a visionary and an adventurer for promising them a footing in Asia Minor ; but since the landing at Smyrna they have only attacked him because the footing is not bigger. After reading a batch of opposition newspapers one is inclined to believe that in foreign policy at least the only crime of Venizelos is that of having kept his promises.

That is all the rational criticism of his policy that one can collect among the leaders of the opposition ; but the very absence of argument here shows that there must have been a very real decline in the popularity of Venizelos among the mass of the people to account for his downfall. There was of course the discontent with war conditions, and the terrible trial of prolonged mobilization, to which he has himself called attention ; although he loyally omitted to point out that that prolongation was largely due to the fact that the Allies took two years to draft a peace with the Turks. The population of Greece has been more or less

in a state of mobilization for eight years, and the interruption of labour would be most keenly resented and less readily understood by the agricultural voters. I have heard from English travellers that in Arcadia it is not uncommon to find peasants of thirty-five who, after serving their two years in 1905 and 1906, were called up for service in the Balkan Wars of 1912, and with very short intermissions in 1914, 1916, and 1919 have been away from their homes ever since. It is easy to believe that these men and their families would vote against any government; but one doubts whether their enthusiasm for Constantine will survive his declared intention of putting himself at the head of his army and leading them to Constantinople or Angora! From this point of view the French plan of docking Constantine's finances would seem to be the surest way of establishing his popularity by putting an end to military enterprises.

A more certain cause of anti-Venizelist feeling is to be found in the abuses and intolerances of administration under the Venizelist régime. Venizelos has been singularly unhappy in his choice of subordinates, many of whom were competent only in the persecution of their political or private enemies. Such unprincipled or fanatical officials found their opportunity in the emergency legislation which the conditions of war and the seditions of Constantine's agents made it necessary to apply. The worst of them was probably the police official responsible for the brutal murder (during the outbreak of reprisals at Athens for the attempted assassination of Venizelos in Paris) of the young, the brilliant, the high spirited Ion Dragoumis, whose death was a greater blow to Greek literature than any number of political downfalls. But there must have been many others in the provinces whose exactions and oppressions, possibly the only organised feature of the local administration, helped to bring the name of Venizelos into disrepute.

All such Venizelists had their chance in the absence of Venizelos, who, such were the exigencies of the Peace Conferences, had spent a total of barely five weeks in Greece since the date of the Armistice; and yet had formerly been accustomed to give his personal attention to every detail of administration and to leave as little as possible to the fallibility of his assistants. The prolonged absences of Venizelos—in the service needless to say of his country, and not, as he once observed, because he preferred

the climate of Western Europe—disastrous as they were to the running of the administrative machine, had another and more subtle reaction on the Greek mentality. There was a feeling, subconscious perhaps, that Venizelos had lost the purest bloom of his nationality. The Greek was jealous for his country when he continually heard Venizelos praising the example of England or France ; and he was equally jealous when he heard England and France continually praising Venizelos, who has certainly suffered much from the incredible tactlessness of his friends. Will it be believed that I have heard an English journalist of some repute telling a Greek audience that he had always admired Venizelos because he was so unlike a Greek ?

Parallel with this estrangement of Venizelos from the land of his strength, this fancy that he was no longer a pure Greek, there has proceeded a steady decline in the popularity of England and France, which might be traced from small beginnings, isolated acts of injustice or oppression, to general reactions of political attitude. Far back in the war period there were no doubt French officers of the Pierre Loti type ; there were poses of arrogance and contempt ; there were all the annoyances to which neutral and insignificant civilians can be subjected by belligerent authority ; there were the extravagances of the British Secret Service, the business of searching, plotting and kidnapping, some of it well illustrated in the censorious narrative of Mr. J. C. Lawson, a Cambridge don who, after giving many years to the study of Greek folk lore, became Naval Intelligence Officer in Crete ; there was a cumulation of pin-pricks and snubs, personal and political, culminating in 1920 in the definite retention of Cyprus, annexed as from November 5, 1914 to the British Empire, and the summary dismissal of the Cypriot delegation. That this retention had little to do with English inclinations or even with antiquated notions of strategic value, but was a definite product and proof of British and French imperialism, most Greeks were probably aware, even if they had not seen the text of the secret Anglo-French agreement for the partition of Turkey of May 9, 1916 (published in *Le Temps*, May 22, 1919), by which, in article 4, ' H.M. Government undertakes ' never to enter into negotiations with a view to the cession of ' Cyprus to a third power without the previous consent of the ' French Government.'

For these and similar reasons Venizelos has fallen, a majority of Greek electors having voted against him ; and some journalists have hastened to brand the whole Greek people as 'traitors,' because a certain number of Greek voters changed their minds. There is as we have seen reason to believe that the voters who turned the scale were those least capable of judging rationally a political issue. But is it not possible to suspect that the war itself has had a share in incapacitating the whole electorate for rational choice? Those who saw the 1918 election in England should be the first to admit the existence of a specific war mentality which is incapable of fine judgments. Wars are not won by the finer qualities. As the less fine leaders, the Cleons, come to the top in a nation at war, so the less fine qualities come to the top in individuals. Unless we are prepared to admit that democracy is a failure we can hardly deny the existence of this war mentality, produced either by herd instinct, or perhaps by some process of auto-intoxication caused by the fatigue of war. It may at least be doubted if any people emerging barely victorious from such a conflict would be capable of choosing an honest leader who always tells his constituents the truth, never promises more than he can perform, and exacts from his countrymen hardship and self-sacrifice.

Venizelos never flattered his countrymen ; he went unconsciously to the other extreme. For, though the Greek lives on flattery—so much so that because his ancestors were the beginning, he thinks that he himself ought to be the present model of European civilisation,—he is yet extraordinarily jealous of his independence and never so happy as when he is defying the world. Venizelos wounded the vanity of the Greeks, shattered their dream of an 'Hellenocentric' universe, by telling them that they were not strong enough to exist as a nation, much less to 'realise their aspirations,' without the support of the Powers : and that the Greek genius was useless in the modern world unless it was informed by English character, strengthened and transmitted by English institutions. His policy has always been based on these principles.

When Venizelos arrived in Greece in 1910 he began immediately to prepare the young State—which, although eighty years old, had never grown up—to enter European society. He reorganized the whole administration and introduced the principles

of permanence and honesty into the civil services. Somehow in eighteen months he provided a navy and an army, although for thirty years Greek politicians had been demanding an army and turning out every government either for not producing an army or for asking them to pay for one. When he had only been a year in office Greece was once more on speaking terms with her neighbours: in 1912 he concluded the alliance with Bulgaria that was the preliminary to the first Balkan War. It was no fault of his that this was followed by the second Balkan War, which broke up the Balkan Alliance. 'M. Venizelos acted with 'admirable moderation,' says Mr. W. E. D. Allen, the writer of a vivid history of 'The Turks in Europe.'

'He was willing to waive the well-substantiated claims of Greece to Southern Thrace and the Ægean coast, where the population was mainly Greek; but expected Bulgaria to compromise her claims to Salonika and its Bulgar-populated hinterland. . . . But the attitude of the Bulgarian delegates was unconciliatory and threatening.'

Venizelos was forced to grasp at the alliance with Serbia, which led to the defeat of Bulgaria and the Treaty of Bucharest (August 10, 1913), instead of the hope of a Balkan Federation.

'If after the war with Turkey (says Mr. Allen again) an amicable settlement had been achieved, the formation of a permanent Balkan league of the two Latin and three Slavonic countries of south-eastern Europe would have been an ideal possible of attainment. Such a political alliance would have been a security for the peace and stability of the Near East.'

Venizelos failed to secure by means of a Balkan federation the relation of Greece to European society. But in the following year the war gave him another opportunity to draw Greece into the system which he regarded as the only vehicle of progress. In September 1914, with a confident country supporting his every act, he proposed to range Greece at the side of England and France. Constantine however, and his supporters—then a mere handful of courtiers, pro-Germans and malcontents—jibbed at this sudden invitation to the party; and Venizelos, believing that the isolation of a young and timid State could never be splendid but must end like the outlaw or the savage in barbarism, at last (October 5, 1916) retired to Salonica, staking the whole future of Greece as a European State on his confidence that the nation would follow him.

His confidence seemed to be justified; for although it was actually England and France who deported Constantine and enabled Venizelos to return to Athens (June 11, 1917) there is little doubt that the majority of the nation still trusted Venizelos, and that had it been wise or possible to put it to the test, he would have repeated the electoral success which he had won, with war explicitly as his programme, in June 1915. And if the majority had really been unwilling it would have been impossible for him, with all the dictatorial powers* in the world, successfully to organize the country for war. Yet the Greek army distinguished itself in the Macedonian campaign of 1918, especially in the storming of the Doiran Heights, which led directly to the Bulgarian surrender.

Directly after the armistice Venizelos left Greece and for two years worked incessantly to present the Greek claims as part of the European settlement. He had so far succeeded that after the Spa Conference Greece was accepted as the mandatory of Europe in Asia Minor. Speaking in the House of Commons on July 21, 1920, Mr. Lloyd George said :—

'Mr. Venizelos . . . expressed the opinion that he would be able to clear up the whole of the neighbourhood between Smyrna and the Dardanelles in the course of fifteen days.'

'His forces were put into action and his plan was carried out. The Greek troops were well organised and admirably led; they fought with great dash and bravery, and they behaved in a manner worthy of the great record of their race, and there is no race in the world that has a more brilliant record, whether in peace or in war. Not only did they clear up that situation in fifteen days, but they did so in ten days.'

'The Greeks . . . have shown strength, capacity, restraint and statesmanship throughout this war. They are a highly intelligent, industrious, brave and competent people—competent as sailors, as cultivators and as traders. They have a great past, and they have the Greek gift—even to the present day—of throwing up great leaders: for Mr. Venizelos is a successor of great leaders; he is not merely a phenomenon. The Allies therefore, without hesitation, utilized the forces at the disposal of the Greek Government for the purpose of

---

* The stringency of his methods has been ludicrously exaggerated by the royalist propaganda. Out of about 30,000 government servants less than 500 were removed from office because they refused to serve after Constantine's departure. See the speech of Venizelos in the Greek Chamber giving full statistics, May 6, 1920.

assisting them to restore order in that part of the world and to enforce the treaty. I think the experiment has been a success. It has been a gratifying success, a promising success, because it shows that when the Greek undertakes to carry out an operation it means that he has very accurately estimated his own strength and the resources at his disposal.'

That operation was hardly the work of an unwilling and dispirited army pining for its divinely rightful leader. Three weeks later (August 10, 1920) the Treaty of Sèvres was signed. The youngest and last invited guest, rather awkward in his new dress suit, had after all distinguished himself at the party; but just as he was being congratulated by the hostess he suddenly bobbed down and made wildly for the door.

Venizelos dragged the Greek peasant out of his proud, ineffectual, and savage isolation into the company of his Balkan neighbours; and then again hurried him, breathless—for there was no time to finish his worldly training—into the greater business of European society. But the Greek has suddenly turned his back on the society of the great and has refused to be a partner in European civilization—such as it is. Among the leaders of the opposition, who now under the Restoration form the Athenian Government, there is hardly a gleam—now that Ion Dragoumis is dead—of anything more than the cleverness of a queue of party politicians, each waiting for his turn and united only in a determination to bang the door on any possibility of conciliation with the new methods, by dismissing any Government servant, from minister to kitchenmaid, who ever expressed or implied admiration for the person or policy of Venizelos. The country must, in effect, sink back into the slough of 'rotativism,' in which perhaps in time each party will provide not only its own refill ministers and kitchenmaids but even its own king; and Greece is not, unfortunately, so rich in competent men that it can produce a duplicate set for all important offices. In turning their backs on Venizelos and all his works the Greeks are rejecting the chance of becoming a European Power, even though they do not realise the extent of their refusal and may some day regret it. The Athenians, as Plutarch reminds us, only forgot the faults of Pericles when it was too late;

'and the troubles they felt after his death made them then lament the loss of so noble a member. For those who unpatiently did brook his

great authority while he lived, because it drowned their own ; when they came after his death to make trial of other speakers and governors, they were compelled then to confess that no man's nature living could be more moderate nor grave, with lenity and mercy, than was his. And that most hated power, which in his lifetime they called tyranny, did now most plainly appear unto them to have been the manifest ramper and bulwark of the safety of their whole state and common weal : such corruption and vice in government of the State did then spring up immediately after his death which, when he was alive, he did ever suppress and keep under in such sort that either it did not appear at all, or at the least it came not to that head and licence that such faults were committed as were impossible to be remedied.'

The Greek, perhaps hardly knowing why, has retired from European society to become again a peasant, secure from the burden of public affairs and dreaming of his past and future greatness. Possibly he is instinctively following the example of the old man who convinced Candide that to work in his garden was a better lot than that of the six kings with whom he had had the honour of sitting down to supper.

' Je présume (said the old man), qu'en général ceux qui se mêlent des affaires publiques périssent quelque fois misérablement et qu'ils le méritent ; mais je ne m'informe jamais de ce qu'on fait à Constantinople ; je me contente d'y envoyer vendre les fruits du jardin que je cultive.'

Possibly the Greek peasant is wisely content with the knowledge that, even if he is not to have the honour of inheriting the Byzantine Empire, he will always, whatever political arrangements are proposed by the diplomatists, possess by the right of his labour the coastlands and harbours of the Ægean Sea.

It is not easy to foretell the immediate political consequences of Constantine's return ; but at any rate it is useless for Philhellenes to argue that the Greeks should not be punished for changing their allegiance ; for if the Treaty of Sèvres is revised Constantine will not be the cause but only the opportunity. France is reluctant that the treaty should be ratified as it stands because she believes that the cheapest way of stabilizing her own position in Asia is by making certain concessions to Turkey ; and so easily satisfied are the conventions of diplomacy that she does not doubt that this can be done without establishing a precedent of ' revision ' which might be applied to the Treaty of Versailles. It cannot be seriously maintained that France would want to turn the

Greek people out of Smyrna only because their king had been a pro-German, in order to establish in their place a people who had been the allies of Germany. But if she can make a friend of Mustafa Kemal, the leader of the Turkish 'Nationalists' at Angora, by giving him Smyrna, she can reduce her military expenditure in Syria and Cilicia which, as General Gouraud recently reported, is becoming alarming. She has in fact already announced the intention of evacuating Cilicia if she can make Mustafa Kemal warden of the marches.*

This is not the place to criticise French policy, but it may be accepted that such is indeed the position into which financial pressure has driven the French Foreign Office. 'Let us revise 'the Sèvres Treaty without hesitation,' says Gustave Hervé in the *Victoire*, 'and make Turkish Nationalism a rampart against Russian Bolshevism in Asia Minor as we have made Poland a 'rampart in Europe.'† It sounds like setting a burglar to guard your household against an epidemic of influenza. But the French are serious; and, now that Armenia seems wisely to have come to terms with Russians on the north and Turks on the south, they are desperately in earnest; for if Armenia is to become a bridge between Lenin and Mustafa, they may themselves have to face the terrors of a red army in Cilicia.

No wonder that they insist on immediately propitiating the Turks and offering Smyrna as a retaining fee. But we may perhaps ask if the journalists who call for Smyrna to be restored to Turkey have ever read the Treaty which they are so anxious to revise. For Smyrna is not in fact lost to Turkey, whose flag is still to be displayed in token of her potential return. Smyrna is not given to the Greeks, but is merely condemned to be governed by its own parliament elected by the 'proportional 'representation of all sections of the population including racial, 'linguistic and religious minorities.'‡ It is this local parliament which may after five years ask the Council of the League of Nations for the 'definitive incorporation' of Smyrna in the kingdom of Greece. Presumably therefore the Turks have only to get a majority in the local parliament in order to ask for the

---

* *Times*, December 21, 1920.

† Quoted in the *Morning Post* December 15, 1920.

‡ Treaty of Sèvres, Article 72.

'definitive incorporation' of Smyrna in the realm of Mustafa Kemal. It is true that the Greek Government is to be responsible for the administration by a 'body of officials which it will appoint 'specially for the purpose,' and is to have other privileges usually associated with sovereignty. But the French, if only to keep up appearances, should surely support their demand for a revision of the Treaty by explaining how the Germans (through Constantine), can benefit, or the Turks suffer, through the imposition on Smyrna and its district of a 'local parliament 'with an electoral system calculated to ensure proportional 'representation.'

British policy is not less cynical than that of France, all foreign policy after all being based on self-interest. But the British Foreign Office is slower than the French, and much more sceptical; so sceptical indeed, that it is often hard to discover whether it has any policy at all. British scepticism should have a salutary influence on the French, and the attitude of reserve has numerous advantages, even if it leads to rather ludicrous expressions of diplomatic disapproval such as the refusal to recognise Constantine officially by the salute of warships or the presence of Ministers.

The truth seems to be that England, being deeply committed in Palestine and Mesopotamia, would be quite content to let Anatolia stew in its own juice, if only she were assured that the Smyrna enclave could be decently policed under a Greek administration. Being as anxious as the French for a cheap settlement she might even follow them into an agreement with Mustafa Kemal, if she had any confidence that Kemal had either the power or the will to establish an orderly block between Russia and Persia. But at present, being better informed than the French, she has no will to rely on the Turks, while she knows that the Greeks, especially perhaps the Greeks of Asia, are an admirable material for good government; she knows too that Venizelos is sincerely devoted to British interests, and sees no reason to despair of his return. She has, moreover, little sympathy with the Levantine pretensions of the Italians, who have always worked against Venizelos, even, it is said, to the extent of inspiring Turkish resistance to the Greek landing at Smyrna in May 1919; and are believed to have helped Constantine to his restoration. She is not therefore likely to

support the Italian plea that the return of Constantine should be made an excuse for ' revising ' the Treaty of Sèvres, with the Greco-Italian Treaty dependent on it, in the sense of allowing Italy to retain not only Rhodes, but all the Greek islands of the Dodekanese.

If we accept as mainly correct the foregoing sketch of Greek, French and English purposes, it is clear, I think, that there is a chance for England to exercise in three directions her traditional policy of compromise. (Only compromise should not mean, as it usually does when the negotiations are left in the hands of Mr. Lloyd George, the mere devising of a form of words which means something entirely different to each party, and causes both to distrust the mediator.)

First of all it is for England to realise that the cheapest, quickest and easiest way to put an end to Kemal's incursions and intrigues, and thereby relieve French anxieties in Syria and Cilicia, is neither to bribe him by treaty nor to subsidize him secretly, but to make peace with the Bolsheviks from whom he draws most of his arms and all his energy.

Secondly, England should strive if possible, but not by threats of starvation, to effect a reconciliation between Constantine and Venizelos, who now that the war is over—a fact which cannot be too often repeated—are separated only by pride and personal antipathy. A complete amnesty, a forgetting of bitter words and foolish acts, is the only hope of restoring order to the Greek State, and putting an end to the *reductio ad absurdum* of party government whereby the king is so definitely identified with one party that the whole civil and diplomatic services, all crown officers, and University professors are dependent on an election, or on the intrigues and conspiracies by which it can be anticipated. Such confusion and hatred can end only in civil war, and although civil war would probably end in the establishment of a Greek Republic, even a republic would be too dear at the price of civil war.

Thirdly, if it prove impossible to arrange for the return of Venizelos, (even if he were to consent, as he almost certainly would, to hold only a minor office under another Prime Minister) or if in any case France persists in her objections to the Athenian control over Smyrna, limited as it is by the terms of the Treaty, it should be for England to propose for the Smyrna enclave a

form of complete local autonomy, in which the English, like the Greeks, have always excelled. Let the Greeks of Ionia elect not only their own parliament but their own magistrates. It will be no disadvantage to the Greek community in Asia to be released from the over-centralised control of Athens, even if the Greek Kingdom survives the present crisis, and is fortunate enough to celebrate the return of Venizelos as cheerfully as it has celebrated the return of Constantine.

JOHN MAVROGORDATO.

BEGINNINGS OF IRISH HISTORY

1. Phases of Irish History. By Eoin MacNeill. Dublin : Gill. 1919

2. The History of Ireland. By Geoffrey Keating, D.D. Edited with Translation and Notes by Rev. P. S. Dinneen, M.A. Nutt (for the Irish Texts Society). 1908.

WHEN the National University of Ireland was established in 1908, a good deal of criticism was directed against the institution of certain new chairs for which no exact precedent existed. One of them was the Professorship of Ancient Irish History. My recollection of its genesis (for I was one of the mere Irish on the constituting Commission which fortified itself with the extraneous but most sympathetic authority of Professor Henry Jackson and Sir John Rhys), is that we started with a clear intention to equip a competent school of Celtic study ; that we realised the essential importance of securing Mr. MacNeill ; and that in considering how best to utilise him we were guided by what he had already done. For already, papers of his in Irish magazines had dealt with semi-mythical Irish history in a manner that threw shafts of light into dark places. Most people who had given any attention to the matter (not an excessive number) were aware that Irish legend comprised two cycles, one centreing round Emain Macha near Armagh in Ulster, with Cuchulain for its Achilles, the other having Tara as its focus and the hero group of Finn and his companions for chief personages. But none of us had thought about the fact that Cuchulain and his rivals or enemies were chariot-fighters like the people in Homer, whereas Finn's people fought on foot and fought as an organised body under a common discipline.

Mr. MacNeill's essays pointed out that Cæsar found the Britons still a race of chariot-fighters, and that the Fiana were probably a force organised after the Roman discipline had become known even to Ireland. That seems now a simple operation of the critical intelligence, yet it showed a mind able to disencumber itself of all the irrelevant details and heave great masses of tradition into some structural order. Native Irish literature

has been singularly lacking in the architectonic faculty. Infinitely laborious in the accumulation of material, it has seldom known how to sift and arrange what it gathered. Here at last was a man who apparently knew the old genealogies like an Ollave of the tenth century, and yet was able to stand away from his facts. So he was set to work professionally at the beginnings of Irish history and the book which he published last year is a very sufficient justification. Through the welter of uncritical chronicling, half fabulous, wholly pedantic, there begins to emerge the story of an island people in which one can discern already, what his own excellent phrase demands for Irish history, ' life, movement, colour, coherence, and human interest,'—or in one word, reality.

At the same time it must not be supposed that his book is, or professes to be, a history of Ireland. Perhaps, but for the chance of politics which made irruption into this student's life—as has happened in greater or less degree to almost every man of letters that has worked in Ireland within living memory—the public lectures which are here printed would never have been delivered and the world outside university classrooms would have waited to know what Professor MacNeill was doing till something more complete was achieved. Here we have in truth no more than a supplement to the existing histories—a supplement which is in very great measure a corrective and a substitution : and since the book (alas, ill-indexed !) presumes in its readers, as the lectures presumed in their hearers, a general acquaintance with much that is in no way universally familiar, it seems best to set out in large lines its conclusions concerning such matters as the composition of Ireland's mixed race and its early political organisation. On both of these heads Professor MacNeill is found rejecting a great deal of what has been habitually regarded as primitive Irish tradition. Yet in truth, as he makes it clear, there are two distinct traditions, or two strata of tradition, differing in kind. The first of them rested on oral record, and was pre-Christian ; the latter grew up after the common use of writing had been introduced by St. Patrick and other missionaries from the Roman world. Both were carefully and methodically compiled, but many elements of sophistication inevitably entered into the second. Mr. MacNeill's endeavour is to get back to the first.

This earlier tradition was preserved by the Druid organisation, which was in fact a clergy, a class of learned clerks, to which were attached the professional poet chroniclers, transmitters of metrical records by trained memory. When Patrick came to Ireland in the fifth century, Druids were among the chief personages about every Irish king; probably they had been so throughout the history of the Gael in Ireland. It was their duty not only to compose the records, but to maintain synchronism and relation among these archives of several kingdoms. After Christianity, the Druids were replaced by the Christian clergy, working in alliance with the still continued schools of poets and chroniclers. They had now in their hands over and above Irish tradition very many Latin books, in which world-chronicles were to be found. The Christian poet-chroniclers felt, like their forerunners, that 'he was no true Ollave who did not 'synchronise and arrange all the records'; and so they set to work at the task of fitting the traditional history of Ireland into the history of the world.

They were working now in a different kind. Written documents were in their hands, they were going to compile written documents, and since somehow or other an account had to be given, conjecture began. They were on far less sure ground than their predecessors, who, trained in a school of professional memorists and reciters, must repeat what they had spent years learning in the presence of others similarly educated and ready to pounce on any departure from the accepted text. When memory is the recognised custodian not only of literature but of law, it is easy to see how jealously it is guarded; the very lack of anything visible or tangible breeds a sancity for it. On the other hand, when people are new to letters, the written word is imposing, and whatever is written down seems at first to have equal credibility. Virgil was as good a document as Eusebius, and Mr. MacNeill shows with great probability how the legends which made the Picts reach Ireland by way of Thrace comes from two stray lines of his about the 'picti Geloni' and 'picti Agathyrsi.'

There comes down to us, then, through these two schools of tradition an odd medley which can be seen under its most typical form in the History of Ireland written by Geoffrey Keating during the early decades of the seventeenth century, while this first

master of modern Irish prose was a fugitive from the law that condemned all priests. Had Keating, a diligent student if ever one lived, been working in touch with his contemporary Ussher, whose work he quotes, much good would have come to both; but unhappily Ussher, the first of the non-Irish residents in Ireland to apply himself to the study of Irish records, was a signatory to the manifesto of twelve bishops demanding that no toleration should be shown to Papists; and he was of the commission which shut down Lynch's school in Galway when that other student of Irish history was teaching 'great numbers 'of scholars'—records say twelve hundred. Thus on the one side Ussher was cut off from the men who not only knew the Irish tradition but were part of it; on the other, Keating, Lynch, and their like were denied contact with the best critical intelligence of that time. And so we have handed down a vast jumble of origins, out of which the unhappy Irish student in our times has been asked to remember that there came first the Parthalonians; then the Nemedians and their enemies the Fomorians; then the Firbolgs, the third colony; fourth the Tuatha de Danann; and fifth and lastly, the Milesians.

Thank heaven, Professor MacNeill abolishes most of this lumber. Parthalonian and Nemedian he consigns to the scrapheap of dead literary invention; Tuatha de Danann and Fomorian are only the memories of obsolete gods. Firbolg and Milesian remain; the Firbolg having a name which was given to survivors of an early Irish people well on into historic times; the Milesian being a literary and honorific cognomen of the Firbolgs' conquerors, the Gaels. We do not know when the Gaels adopted it; but we may be sure that the legendary Mil, from whom chroniclers traced their descent, was a late invention, and that the name itself derives simply from the Roman 'Miles.' It is an early tribute to Rome's fame even beyond the boundaries of Roman conquest—which never extended to Ireland.

So far back as either history or tradition can reach, Ireland was inhabited by a people whose speech was Gaelic—a Celtic tongue, related but not closely related, to the Celtic tongue used in Britain which survives in Welsh and in Breton. The philologists divide them by the use of Q in one language where the other has a P. Thus 'five' is 'cúig' in Irish, 'pump' in Welsh, just as 'quinque' in Latin corresponds to 'pente' in Greek. But

neither in Ireland nor in Britain was the race exclusively Celtic when Celts ruled. The Picts, who survived to Bede's time in North Britain as a race keeping their own language, were in Ireland also, and their identity was clearly recognised well on into historic times, though in Ireland they had adopted Gaelic. 'Picti' is of course, the Latin name given from their habit of tatooing; the Irish called them Cruithin, which is Qreteni, the linguistic Q equivalent for Pretanoi, by which name the Greeks called the peoples of both islands. Up to the eighth century, the Cruithin were known in Ireland by that name, and they kept a considerable stretch of territory in East Ulster; smaller patches of them held on elsewhere. These were among the 'rent 'paying communities,' recognised as descendants of the earlier folk over whom the Gaels ruled. Some of these had tribe names, bearing no other signification; as for instance the Érainn in the south, from whom Ireland got its Gaelic name, Ériu, or in the dative form Eirinn. The Gaels, a Celtic people from mid-Europe, came at Ireland from the south, and would naturally call the whole land after the first race they knew in it.

Mr. MacNeill does not pretend to tell us how these various pre-Celtic peoples were ethnologically related, nor whether they all belonged to the same stock. It is clear however, that Cruithin was never used as a name for them collectively. The name Firbolg was so used, at a later period, when the different tribes had begun to lose their identity; and Firbolg, as all tradition recognises, is the name of a craft—the 'men of the leathern bag.' One of the most interesting passages in this book points out that Firbolg is only one in a group of such names. One 'rent paying community bore the significant name of 'Ceardrighe, the Smith-folk.' Another has several variant names each of which includes the Irish word 'Seim,' a rivet, and 'this people dwelt in the Desi territory of Munster, where 'copper mines are found which were worked in the Bronze 'Age' (as archaeological discovery proves), 'by miners using 'tools of stone and wood.' They probably paid their rent in copper rivets. Mr. MacNeill holds that those queer people, the tinker clans of modern Ireland and Scotland, may be survivors from some of these 'ancient industrial communities.' One might add that the 'fisherman caste' which he believes on similar grounds to have existed on the banks of the lower Shannon

may be represented by the ' Sons of Men,' a hereditary clan of netmen who monopolise the snap-net fishing at the head of the Shannon's tideway.

Archaeology proves that the Celts of Central Europe were working iron seven centuries before the Christian era. Professor MacNeill points out luminously what resulted. The great trouble of early man in Central Europe was to get ground cleared of trees and tilled. Bronze implements could never be plentiful, but once the secret of working iron was discovered, it could be in every man's hand ; and so ' iron became, and has ever since ' remained the sole master of growing wood.' Better implements of tillage produced a denser population, better weapons produced a people able to conquer land for their overflow, and that is his theory of the early Celtic migrations which were not induced, like later movements of European peoples, by pressure from east and north, but radiated in all directions. It seems that the Celtic overflow did not reach Ireland quickly ; there is no trace of the iron age in Ireland, according to archaeologists, before 350 B.C. This view falls in well with a passage in Keating's re-telling of the early Irish history, which affords an example of the stuff out of which scholars have to reconstruct the past. In the third century B.C. an Irish prince, whose name in English is Lowry the Mariner, was a fugitive in France, for his father's mother had been daughter of the king of France. Word was sent him to come back with force to regain his own territory. He got from the King of France ' a fleetful, that is two thousand ' two hundred,' and with them slew and defeated the king who had slain both his father and grandfather. ' And it was he ' says Keating ' who first made in Ireland spears with broad greenish ' blue heads ; for " laighne " means spears having wide green-blue ' iron heads ; and from these spears the name Laighin is given ' to the people of the province of Gailian, which is now Leinster.' Here is some distinct surviving memory of the coming of iron, and of its coming from Gaul. There is, I think, no earlier mention of France in Irish story as Keating tells it.

Tradition puts the earlier of the Irish legendary cycles about the time when Cæsar was meeting chariot fighters in Britain ; the second, some three centuries later. Tradition however, fails to recognise the marked political change which had modified Ireland between the periods to which these cycles relate. The

sagas enable us to correct what passed for history. Work of invention though they are, these stories had assuredly an historic origin like the Iliad or the Border Ballads ; while a good deal of unconscious fiction entered into the annals. One of the chief sources of error is the tendency to read into the past the usages of the writer's time. Those upon whose chronicles Keating based his history knew an Ireland which in theory accepted the supremacy of a High King, though in practice the land was (like all the European countries of the same period) torn by contest between the central monarchy and the ambitions of local rulers. The chroniclers were evidently predisposed to the principle of a monarchy ; they knew it to have existed from the time when Irish history began to be written, for it was there when St. Patrick came to Ireland. Everything prompted them to make it as old as their race in their country, and Keating, with a multitude of others, helped to hand down from them a tradition concerning the government of Ireland which does not square with what the stories reveal.

The famous epic of the 'Táin' tells how Queen Maeve of Connacht went out to invade Ulster, to capture the Brown Bull of Cooley. What lies behind this is a war among the 'Five Fifths' of Ireland'—an expression still used, and traceable back to this early chariot-fighting period, when Ireland was a Pentarchy. Connacht was leading against Ulster its own force, with contingents from Munster and from the two kingdoms of Leinster, one of which had its seat at Tara ; but there is no trace whatever that to this kingship any supremacy attached. If there was any hegemony, it belonged to Connacht ; Connacht was destined to destroy the Pentarchy. Its power spread across the Shannon and extended to the Hill of Usnech, the traditional centre of Ireland.

Then came, more than a century later, about 250 A.D. the conquest of Tara. This marks the end of the Pentarchy ; but there was still no High King. If Professor MacNeill is right, Cormac MacArt, who captured Tara, and the kings after him for a hundred years, were 'princes of the Connacht dynasty' then ruling also in Tara.' This dynasty was in alliance with Munster, and at war with Ulster. Cormac began to pare down the Ulster territory, then extending to the Boyne. But his main conquest was in North Leinster, and he drove out from its

boundary the Desi a ' vassal community,' who were the chief fighting force of North Leinster. The migration of this people is a well attested fact. One body of them crossed the sea and settled in South Wales, ' where descendants of their princes ' still held sway in the eighth century.' The other body moved into Southern Leinster, and later on entered into alliance or service with the King of Munster. But while Cormac was banishing one non-Gaelic tribe of fighting men, he was apparently using the services of another. Finn belonged to them and so did Ossian and Oscar. Finn was the head of a soldiery, whose name Fiana comes from ' fian,' a band of fighting men. ' From ' it is derived " feindid, feinnidh," a professional soldier.' All the mythology that has grown up about the record of the Fiana masks the fact that they were a permanent fighting force kept in the service of the king who had annexed Tara and done away with one of the Five Fifths—the kingdom of North Leinster. Evidently they were a force of a new type—and quite probably may have been formed after the model of those legionary forces which had conquered Gaul and most of Britain—just as the Zulu impi was framed on the white man's system of drill.*

The Fiana, like other early bodies of professional soldiery, became mutinous and endangered the realm ; they were finally destroyed in battle by Cormac's successor. A kingship that could do this was a strong power, and in the next century princes of the race that ruled in Tara undertook the conquest of Ulster. Armagh fell to them, and what is now Monaghan and Tyrone with the greater part of Fermanagh and Derry. This conquered territory got the name of Oriel—its inhabitants being known as Oir-Ghialla, the eastern Gillies, that is, subjects. That indicates clearly, though apparently no one saw it before Professor MacNeill, that ' the conquering power at the time when the name ' came into use was still regarded as the western power, its home

---

* Need one say that there is no implication of a similar racial inferiority ? But it is worth adding that Professor MacNeill might very well set one of his best students to study recent African history, Abyssinian, Moorish, Fula, Touareg, as well as that of the purely negro tribes, for the light that it throws on the early days of Ireland, up to and including the Norman conquest. Mary Kingsley's ' West African Studies ' contain much that will apply to Ireland.

'was Connacht.' So the Fifth of Ulster like the Fifth of North Leinster ceased to exist as a kingdom. Munster remained, not merely intact, but growing in the south as Connacht was growing in the centre. Somehow it won Clare from Connacht, and so got across the Shannon south of Lough Derg. With the help of the Desi, whom Cormac had driven out of North Leinster, it spread east and conquered the region between the tidal Suir and tidal Blackwater, now the Decies in County Waterford. More than this, it won from Leinster that country beside the Golden Vale which contains the Rock of Cashel; and here on this natural fortress was fixed the seat of a sovereignty which became in reality stronger than anything ever established in Tara. The name Cashel is of course 'Castellum,' and it is one of the first clear indications of Roman influence in Ireland.

The extension and consolidation of Munster took place under a dynasty which ousted those who ruled when the Pentarchy existed. These earlier kings were princes of the Erainn or Iverni, the pre-Gaelic people from whom the island got its name. Their conquerors were, according to Professor MacNeill, Gaels of a later advent than the first invaders; they may well have come from a Gaul which already knew the Roman 'castella.' One might guess that the name Milesians came with them; it could scarcely have belonged to invaders of 350 B.C. At all events these Gaelic kings of Munster, the Eoghanacht, or Eugenian line, ruling from Cashel, ruled so that 'during 'the early Christian centuries, before the Norse invasions, 'Munster appears to have enjoyed greater tranquillity than any 'other realm in Western Europe.' St. Patrick did much less in Munster than in the regions north of it, because he had less to do. Christianity was there before he came. In the other half of Ireland, a strong monarchy was still pushing its acquisitions northward. Niall of the Nine Hostages, who reigned about 400 A.D., had a brother Brian, who took possession of what was afterwards Brefny—roughly Leitrim and Cavan. Niall's three sons conquered the present country of Donegal; Tir Connell keeps the name of one, Inish-Owen of another. There were now seven kingdoms: Munster, Leinster, Connacht, with Ulster, split into three kingdoms of which Oriel was in the centre, the Donegal kingdom in the west, with its seat at Ailech on the peninsula between Lough Foyle and Lough Swilly, and eastern

Ulster, keeping its original name Ulaidh, still unconquered from Louth to Antrim. The seventh kingdom, which was now called Meath, with its seat at Tara, was the chief centre of power. That was Ireland as St. Patrick found it. Niall was in fact the first High King, and before Patrick's coming three successors of Niall had strengthened the central power, which exercised oppression over Leinster. That kingdom was under a special tribute to, and constantly at war with Tara, constantly endeavouring to fight against the new order. Long centuries did not do away this old sense of injustice, or the internal unrest that came from it.

The predominance of the Connacht dynasty found, as Professor MacNeill puts it, ' natural expression in the High Kingship.' What has been always represented as an original institution peculiar to the Irish, was in fact a late growth among them, not unlike what grew up elsewhere. Niall of the Hostages appears to have been the first to impose new lordships over old, ' depressing ' the existing ruler but leaving him still in authority. In so doing, he anticipated what was done by the Normans in Ireland, and by feudal lords everywhere. What is really peculiar to Ireland is the arrangement by which High Kingship alternated between two branches of the same dynasty.

Fifty years after St. Patrick's coming, the King of Tara, representing the Uí Neill, or Niall's descendants, of the southern branch, made a league with the Uí Neill of the kingdom of Ailech in the north, and they defeated the ruling king, whose real abode was in Connacht. After this battle, the kingdom of Connacht was disconnected from Tara ; the king of Tara who won the battle succeeded as High King, on the understanding that he in turn should be succeeded by the King of Ailech. So began the alternation of High Kingship between northern and southern branch of the Uí Neill, which lasted five centuries and a-half, with two interruptions. The second of these was extraordinarily important. Brian Boru is in modern estimation a national hero ; he created a more genuine unity in Ireland than it had ever known, and the unity so created (far from complete though it was), defeated the Norsemen at Clontarf. But in the eyes of Irish tradition, Brian was a usurper, and his breach of the traditional succession left a confusion in which, after his death, his work of unification was undone. Yet it was a tradition

incompatible with national strength, and one that could only have been established in a time of great peace.

Of the centuries that followed St. Patrick's mission, which Mr. MacNeill calls the golden age of Ireland, it may be said that Southern Ireland was quietly ruled from Cashel, and that throughout the country at large there was peace sufficient to allow a rapid development in culture. The truth is that Ireland took greedily to Christianity, and to certain aspects of Christian civilisation, but neglected others. There was no municipal life about which Christianity could group itself; purely Gaelic Ireland (in this as in other things, like Abyssinia in our times), had no town-dwelling population. The settlements which grew up under Christianity were monastic, and they were real centres of study; but it was not in the character of the race to build; perhaps the extreme asceticism which has stamped the Irish sense of religion repudiated ornament. But beyond question Christianity fostered in Ireland the love of learning, and the respect of literature—not only for Latin learning but for their own literature. The 'vulgar tongue' was cultivated in Ireland centuries before French and English came to be written down. Patrick and his successors, annexing for Christianity the whole organisation of druidism, were bound to maintain the alliance with Irish metrical skill. This union of studies, linking skill in their own language with skill in the still living Latin, linking devout attention to Ireland's own records with gluttonous reading of whatever Latin of the Christian ages had to tell, made a healthy intellectual atmosphere. Ireland in the seventh century had probably more real university life than it was to know again, at all events till the twentieth; Professor MacNeill very justly emphasises the fact that Gaelic Ireland did for itself at a surprisingly early date in European history what its later masters never did for it.

Neither was Christianity without its effect on the rulership. For half a century before Patrick's coming, the Irish had been constantly raiding across the Channel and into Gaul. Mr. MacNeill's quite novel interpretation of the name 'Scotti,' by which the Irish came to be known at this period, relates to the Irish verb 'scothaim,' to strike or cut quickly: so that these Cutters would have come to be known by a name which had no more racial significance than 'Vikings'—or 'Boxers' in modern

Chinese history. St. Patrick who himself first saw Ireland as a captive, after one of these raids of the Cutters, so wrought upon those whom he evangelised, that 'the Irish ceased to be a 'predatory nation.' Within their own boundaries there was fighting, but no continuous war nor organisation for it, no grave encroachment of one kingdom on another. The exception was in the repeated struggles of Leinster to regain its hold on Tara and its territory; fourteen battles were fought in less than seventy years up to 517, when Leinster finally gave in.

In the sixth and seventh centuries the Irish were probably among the most peaceful and useful peoples in Europe. They paid for their peacefulness when Norse raiders came in the eighth and ninth centuries; but the struggle of Ireland against this formidable power was not less but greater than that of other States. Professor MacNeill points out that the two countries in Europe which offered most successful resistance to the Norsemen were Ireland and Scotland, which had been unified under the rule of Irish Gaels. In both cases the principle of monarchy was essential to success. In Scotland, it existed in a simple form; the Irish prince Fergus Mac Erc, who went from his principality in Northern Antrim to conquer across the water about 470, belonged to the time when the High King's power was beginning to be clearly established; and he allowed no subject kings in his new realm. In Ireland, the complex and clumsy system, which had grown up by tradition in the peaceful centuries, went to pieces under the strain of combat with invaders. The old feud between Tara and Leinster gave an opening, too, and the Norsemen, settling at Dublin, where Meath and Leinster touch, were at a joint in Ireland's armour. Much was suffered, much destroyed, before a monarchy arose strong enough to weld Ireland together; and it was not the kingdom of either Northern or Southern Uí Neill, nor yet the ancient dynasty of Cashel. The rulers of Thomond had been sub-kings; they became rulers of Munster by their success against the Danes. Mahon, a very able warrior, was succeeded by an abler, Brian; and Brian, in order to achieve his ends, disregarded all traditional right, and made himself supreme Lord of Ireland.

So much is generally known; yet I have never before seen noted what lies in the words still plainly legible in the Book of Armagh, where the confirmation of grants to the primatial see

was written down by a secretary ' in presence of Brian, Emperor ' of the Irish,' ' in conspectu Briain imperatoris Scottorum.' The word ' imperator ' implies a more ambitious conception of High Kingship than can be traced in earlier days. As Professor MacNeill points out, Ireland, though just outside the limit reached by Roman power in Britain, was profoundly conscious of the Empire. As there was a king of Ireland, so there was a king of the world—emperor of all the world that Ireland was concerned with. Then came Charlemagne, and the monarchy of the world was split in two ; emperor had a new significance. It was a unifying overlordship that Brian aimed at, and as Mr. MacNeill indicates, the use of this word on this occasion by his secretary was meant to correspond to his pretensions.

After Brian's death, his work in Ireland fell asunder, like that of Charlemagne in Europe. Irish monarchy was never again a real thing. The extraordinarily intricate system of succession, on which also Professor MacNeill has thrown new light, gave rise to innumerable occasions for civil war. It is new to most students that the institution of choosing a ' tanist,' or successor-designate, in the ruler's lifetime, was only adopted after the Irish had experience of the Norman plan of transmission from father to eldest son. It was an expedient to avoid disputed successions, while preserving what seemed the advantage of choosing the person best fitted for the king's office among those qualified to succeed. Yet, as this book points out, this seeming advantage was really a drawback ; a weak king needed ministers, an able king could attempt to do all himself. Thus the essential principle of devolution was weakened ; the reality of power was much more confined to the ruling family ; and this limitation lessened the chance of finding a man in power large-minded enough to think in terms of Ireland as a whole.

Brian's death was followed by six generations of internecine strife in which it is plain that Ireland desired peace through unity, and despaired of finding it under any Irish head. Henry's coming to exercise overlordship was clearly not unwelcome to a very great part of Ireland ; only when that overlordship revealed itself as predatory did revolt begin ; and even so, within little more than a hundred years, the overlordship of Ireland was offered first to a Norse King, then to a Scot. It was only after Edward Bruce had failed that the real struggle of Ireland against the foreign dominion began.

That phase of Irish history is little dealt with in this book; yet here, too, Professor MacNeill has done invaluable work of correction and suggestion by pointing out that the word 'galloglass,' often interpreted as describing some special type of armed warrior, simply means a foreign soldier (Gall-óglach), and that the galloglasses, Scottish mercenaries, were the first standing army raised for the work of resistance. But lack of space prevents discussion of many tempting topics in this volume, which, as Professor MacNeill recognises, has perhaps too much—especially in its later chapters—the tone of a controversial apologia. Yet in these he certainly rectifies historic perspective by reminding readers that undisciplined localism and the strifes resulting from it were in no way peculiar to Ireland in that day. He lays, perhaps, too much emphasis on the signs of a national consciousness in Ireland. Except in Hellas, where did such a thing exist before the twelfth, thirteenth or fourteenth century? And what did it amount to in Hellas? So far as this one may agree—that the Irish had at least as much conception of nationality as any other people; they thought of Ireland as one, and they had a common system of laws, though with local administration and interpretation of them.

The main concern of this review, however, is to point out that for early Irish history we have material more abundant than for that of other outlying parts of Europe. These documents have never before been treated by a man of first class ability, possessing the essential qualifications—which are, primarily, a richly nourished knowledge of the Irish sources and, secondly, a power to bring this knowledge into fruitful contact with other subsidiary fields of research. Such work is largely a matter of inductive and deductive inference which must be in some measure conjectural, and nobody will suppose that Professor MacNeill has always guessed right. But he has made interesting and intelligible what was bewildering and unintelligible before. Ireland in his account of it begins for the first time to appear as a normal phenomenon in European history—a country with its strongly marked peculiarities, but a country following, up to a certain point, the main lines of European development. With the story of its arrested development, his book is not concerned.

STEPHEN GWYNN.

IRISH UNREST REVIEWED

1. The Irish Rebellion of 1641. By Lord Ernest Hamilton. John Murray. 1920.
2. Lecky's History of England in the 18th Century. Vol. II. Longmans, Green.
3. The Soul of Ulster. By Lord Ernest Hamilton. Hurst & Blackett. 1917.
4. Report of Select Committee on Outrages in Ireland. 1852.
5. The Reconquest of Ireland. By James Connolly. Dublin: Maunsel. 1917.
6. The Evolution of Sinn Fein. By R. Mitchell Henry Fisher Unwin. 1920.
7. Red Terror and Green. By Richard Dawson. John Murray. 1920.

THE open and undisguised campaign of rebellion and cold-blooded assassination in Ireland during the past year has excited world-wide attention and horror. And yet it is only one more inexorable page in Irish history illustrating the psychology of the Irish temperament and its methods under the pressure of social and political causes. Those methods have always been of the same barbarous character ; so much so, that they invite enquiry as to whether there may not be a new department of criminology entitled hereditary or national crime, inherent in the blood. Certainly Irish crime and outrage—whatever may have been the contemporary causes—have always proved true to historic type for three centuries, and afford a strange commentary on civilization ; moreover, they have never altered with the improved physical, social and mental conditions of the Irish people. It is this that makes the subject worthy of serious recollection and consideration.

Early in the sixteenth century King James I. on his accession found himself confronted with the Irish problem. The Elizabethan wars had finally ended in the defeat and flight of the O'Neills and the O'Donnells, and the disruption of their attempted native confederation against English rule. The result was huge confiscations of lands and the great plantation of Ulster, planned by the King. Thirty-two years of internal

peace ensued in Ireland. A second generation of English and Scotch settlers had sprung up, and apparently lived on friendly terms with the native-born Irish. Then suddenly, on October 22nd 1641 the great Irish Rebellion broke out and took the form of a religious war of the bitterest kind. With the actual causes of this war it would be out of place here to deal. It is with the methods of the rebellion and its successors that the present enquiry is concerned.

Of all the Irish writers of Irish history, Mr. Lecky is the most moderate and the most magnanimous. His account of the character and methods of the Rebellion may be shortly stated : ' There can be no real question,' he says, ' that the Rebellion in ' Ulster was extremely horrible, and was accompanied by great ' numbers of atrocious murders.' What that number was has been hotly disputed, but it certainly ran into 80,000, and included massacres of large bodies of men, women and children in various places. For four months the rebels in Ulster were in complete command of the province, and ghastly scenes were enacted, which have never been forgiven or forgotten by the descendants of the Protestant colonists of those days.

Hundreds of depositions taken in 1642, and now in Trinity College, Dublin, prove and describe the barbarous methods of the rebels. Mr. Lecky gives examples :—

> ' At least eighty persons of both sexes were precipitated into the river from the Bridge at Portadown ; and as many in the same manner at Corbridge, in the County of Armagh. Two cases are told of houses crowded with English or Scotch, which were burnt, and nearly all within burnt to ashes. A Presbyterian who was carried a prisoner by the rebels, saw not less than twenty-five murders committed in a single night. A ghastly story is told of forty or fifty Protestants in Fermanagh, who were persuaded to apostasize, and then all murdered.'

Witnesses after witnesses relate in their depositions the horrors of murders perpetrated in their presence by hanging, drowning and barbarous ill-treatment.

Sir Phelin O'Neil's campaign was a horrible episode in the north, and his atrocities were largely corroborated by his own confession. We are told that when the Irish had met with some bloody reverses, ' rivers of blood were inhumanly shed.' On any ill-success he would, in a fury, order his prisoners to be murdered, or some other act of barbarous and senseless cruelty

to be perpetrated. The temporary result of these horrors was that the whole English plantation vanished from the Ulster countryside, the survivors sheltering in the walled towns and the fugitives thronging south to Dublin, where perchance they might find safety. Lord Ernest Hamilton has recently published a detailed history of this rebellion, which explains clearly why Ulster objects to Home Rule.

This sudden upheaval was at last met by the Parliament of England and defeated by Cromwell, but only after many years' fighting, at the cost of a religious war stained with terrible crimes and reprisals. As Lord Ernest Hamilton says in another interesting volume, 'The Soul of Ulster':—

> 'The 1641 massacre may unhesitatingly be put down as the most disastrous occurrence in the history of the island, for—apart from its own intrinsic horrors—it laid the seeds of an undying distrust among future generations of colonists, and in its own generation it brought in its train twelve years of unintermittent civil warfare. These twelve years proved the most devastating Ireland had known. All the worst passions of men were let loose. Reprisals followed on atrocities, and further atrocities followed the reprisals. On the top of both came famine and plague, and by the time peace was finally established, nearly a third of the total population of Ireland had perished.'

Cromwell's conquest decided the fate of Ireland as an integral portion of the British Commonwealth, but it left the social side of the country unsettled and full of unrest.

For many years after the restoration of the Stuarts to the throne of England there was a recrudescence of crime and disorder. The confiscation of lands produced great poverty amongst the old proprietors and their retainers. These carried on a guerilla warfare against the new order of Irish affairs, even after the Revolution, and were called rapparees and tories. They were treated as felons and revenged themselves in due course, pillaging and murdering in bands from their hiding places in the mountains of Leinster and Munster. Life was not considered on either side. From time to time some half-starved robber appeared with the bloody head of his comrade, claiming the pardon of the Government and asking for food. Fugitive rapparees were relentlessly pursued, but were seldom caught in face of a sullen and hostile population. All the succeeding deeds of barbarous murder became precedents for succeeding generations, and too closely have they been followed and improved upon.

However, under the Hanoverian dynasty actual civil war ceased for nearly one hundred years, and the result was a great advance in all the outward signs of material prosperity. Dublin was practically rebuilt in splendid fashion. Agriculture was transformed, and trade and commerce improved, notwithstanding the jealousy and restrictions of British manufacturers. But underneath this fair seeming on the surface, old animosities and ancient ambitions revived. The successful revolt of the American Colonies left a deep and abiding mark on Irish life and society, awaking dreams of similar happenings on this side the Atlantic. Grattan's Parliament was set up by the threats of the Volunteer movement, and by the end of the century Ireland had been the theatre of French invasions and seditious plots, ending in rebellion and civil war.

But before these latter political complications economic causes had produced local disturbances, and the formation of powerful secret societies ; of these the Whiteboys were the most important. The immediate cause of the Whiteboy organisation was economic —a long-continued murrain amongst cattle in England, which raised immensely the value of pasture land in Ireland. Tenants were evicted in order to convert arable into pasture. The result was an agrarian insurrection in 1761 which took the form of a revolt against the payment of tithes, particularly the potato tithe. The Whiteboys were so called from the dress they wore in their raids : white linen frocks and white cockades. They sent threatening letters, compelled allegiance to their leader under threats of savage penalties, levelled fences, dug up ground and ham-strung cattle. Large bodies of men moved exactly like regular troops and appeared to be thoroughly disciplined.

The Whiteboy organisation struck deep root and spread rapidly, growing in audacity and influence for more than twenty-five years. It was admittedly the precursor of all similar Irish secret societies which have existed since the eighteenth century. Their deeds have been imitated at every epoch of social or political disturbances, no matter what improvements have been made in the laws of the country. In some cases they acted with all the audacity of open insurgents and awaited an encounter with soldiers. They broke open the jail of Tralee and released the prisoners. They threatened to burn the town of Newmarket unless a Whiteboy confined there was released. They burnt

houses which soldiers had occupied. On one occasion they assembled at Lismore and affixed a placard at the Post Office requiring the inhabitants under severe threats to illuminate their houses and provide a certain number of horses, bridled and saddled, on the following night; and the injunction was punctually obeyed. Great numbers of cattle and sheep were killed or ham-strung. In 1778 a letter tells how a single person passing from Ballinasloe Fair to Clara had 760 sheep killed in one night and next morning no one dared to send him a horse to carry away the carcases, or to bid for them more than 3s. 6d. a sheep, that being the rate which the Whiteboy proclamation had prescribed.

Mr. Lecky gives a vast amount of information on the excesses of the Whiteboy movement. One of their mildest atrocities was to drag a man at midnight from his bed, often in mid-winter, beat him and leave him bound and naked in a ditch. Not infrequently they carried their victim to a newly-dug grave and left him, sometimes with his ears cut off, buried up to the chin in earth or in thorns or furze. A man appropriated 2-lbs. of powder which had been concealed for the Whiteboys. They discovered him, and having obliged him to pour the powder into his hat, they placed it beneath him, ignited it and blew him to pieces. Their threatening notices were filled with the most savage menaces and their outrages in some districts were so frequent and so severe that scarcely anyone dared to resist them.

The insurrection sprang (says Mr. Lecky) from intolerable misery, not a little aggravated by injustice, but it speedily drew into its vortex all the restless criminal and turbulent elements of the community, and its demoralizing influence can hardly be exaggerated. For a time it paralysed the law. Who were the inventors of the system will never be known, but they were evidently men of some education and of no small organizing ability. They created a system of intimidation which in many districts became the effective government of the Catholic peasantry, and which made it often much safer to violate than to obey the law. After 150 years exactly the same statement is true, in spite of the removal of every material grievance. Whiteboyism was the result of almost hopeless wretchedness. But the savage methods used in those days remain in use to the present day, in spite of the complete disappearance of the former poverty.

Grattan's Parliament came into existence in 1782. During its short existence of eighteen years it passed no less than fifty-four 'Coercion' Acts. *Ab uno disce omnes.* The general spirit of riot and insurrection occasioned the passing of a law in 1787 entitled 'An Act to prevent tumultuous risings and assemblies 'and for the more effectual punishment of persons guilty of 'outrage, riot, and illegal combinations and of administering and 'taking unlawful oaths.'

While the South of Ireland was distracted by the Whiteboys, the North was convulsed by two secret societies known as 'Peep-of-Day Boys' and 'Defenders.' The former were recruited by Presbyterians, and the latter by Roman Catholics. Both at first were animated by revolutionary ideas born of the revolt of the American Colonies, but internal dissensions ripened into religious hatred and violence. The Presbyterians destroyed the Catholics' property and secret assassination was resorted to by the Defenders. The result was a downright religious war, which lasted for years, in which the fanatics of both sects exercised barbarous outrages and revenge. One example is enough :—

'A large estate had been devised by a Mr. Jackson, of Forkhill, for the improvement of agriculture and the education of the surrounding peasantry, one of the bequests providing four schoolmasters for instructing children of all denominations. The Defenders offered every opposition and one evening the house of Barclay, one of the schoolmasters, was raided by a band of men. Barclay was seized, thrown on his face and three of them stood on him and stabbed him repeatedly. They then put a cord round his neck, forcing out his tongue, part of which they cut off. They then cut off the four fingers and thumb of his right hand, and left him on the floor, and proceeded to use his wife in the same manner with a blunt weapon, an operation which took them ten minutes. Her brother, a boy of thirteen, had come that morning from Armagh to see her. They cut out his tongue and the calf of his leg, and left all three in that dreadful situation.' *

We pass on to the Rebellion of 1798, which broke out in May of that year. Here, although dreadful atrocities were committed on both sides, they were committed more in open warfare than by secret societies. But the mode and methods of the Rebellion of 1798 bear the old hall-mark of barbarism which was so evident in the Rebellion of 1641 and in the doings of the Whiteboys. It became a religious war, and brought with it all its horrors and

* Report of the Trustees to the Bishop Dromore.

reprisals. Cruelties were committed on both sides, and the insurrection in Wexford was particularly marked by terrible outrages and inhumanity. The signal for a general rising was given on May 26th by a Roman Catholic priest, Father John Murphy, with a fire lighted on the hills of Corrigena. From its magnitude and sanguinary character the Wexford insurrection soon dwarfed all the other disturbances in Ireland. From its commencement, Vinegar Hill, near Enniscorthy, was the centre of the scene.

'Scarcely any other spot in Ireland (says Mr. Lecky in his history) is associated with memories so tragical and so hideous. The country around was searched and plundered, and great numbers of Protestants were brought to the rebel camp, confined to the old windmill, or in a barn at the foot of the hill, and then deliberately butchered. . . . The dead bodies were left unburied to be devoured by the swine or by the birds. Some were thrown into the river. Some were slightly covered with sand. One man, who had been stunned and pierced with a pike, was thrown into a grave while still alive, but a faithful dog scraped away the earth that covered him and licked his face till he revived.'

More than 500 people thus perished on Vinegar Hill. Let readers refer to contemporary writers for further details of wholesale massacres on the Bridge of Wexford; at the Barn of Scullabogue, where more than 200 victims were confined in a barn which was set on fire, smothering them to death; and at other places where similar methods of barbarism were carried out. Enough has been said to show that the methods of 1641 were repeated after 157 years, and again the attempted rebellion and the setting up of a separate State or Republic in Ireland failed after rapine and bloodshed, red ruin and the breaking up of laws. Is it not an extraordinary instance of history repeating itself to find to-day the same sequence of insurrection, outrage and murder repeated after another interval of 120 years? Again, it may be asked: Can there be some primitive blood-lust inherent in the Irish nature?

The result of the Rebellion of 1798 was the passing of the Act of Legislative Union between Ireland and Great Britain. For fifteen years afterwards the Kingdom was engaged in a death struggle with Napoleon, until Waterloo brought victory to England and salvation to Europe. But there was no rest in Ireland from the bitter strife of civil commotions and social

and political disturbances. Added to all came the long struggle of O'Connell for Catholic emancipation, which, unfortunately, evoked much passionate controversy and bitter feeling. O'Connell was the first to apply the arts of agitation and, willingly or unwillingly, his example on the public platform first encouraged and then inflamed all the predilection of Irish secret conspirators for violence and outrage. Underneath O'Connell's constitutional agitations with regard to the tithe, to Catholic emancipation, to repeal of the Union and to the land question, there was a dark secret network of organised sedition and crime under-pinning and supporting the open-air efforts and appeals of himself and of the various Nationalist leaders during the whole of the nineteenth century.

The Ribbon Society, which had its origin after the Union, inherited all the principles and machinery of the Whiteboys and their colleagues in crime of the eighteenth century, bettering them as new instruments of violence and terrorism were invented. The most authentic account of this secret society is to be found in the evidence taken before the Select Committee on Outrages in Ireland, and ordered by the House of Commons to be printed in 1852. It is worth mentioning that there sat on that Committee (amongst others) Mr. John Bright, Sir James Graham and Mr. Henry Drummond. The originating cause of the appointment of the Committee was the extraordinary amount of agrarian crime committed for many years previous. In 1849 the total number of homicides reported was 203 ; cases of firing at the person 98 ; other serious offences against the person 1,175, and minor offences against the person 18,550. No less than 2,719 persons were transported, and only 37 executed. The grand total for the year of all offences was 209,681. These figures were vouched for and handed in to the Committee by an official witness, Mr. H. J. Brownrigg, Deputy Inspector-General of Constabulary.

The machinery of the Ribbon Society and its methods were accurately described in this evidence. No Protestant was admitted as a member. It was purely a Roman Catholic organisation. In each district where the conspiracy existed the governing body consisted of a small body of men with a master chairman or president. The rank and file were oath-bound and provided with a pass or travelling ticket, which enabled them to prosecute a journey of outrage without being molested.

Above the parish bodies was a body of county members. The root of the system was the agrarian question, and beneath was the idea and belief of getting the land back from the landowners free of rent by physical force. But the idea of physical force was not confined to the agrarian question. When any confederation of any kind or any society was got up the Ribbon Society fastened itself upon it. Thus Tenant Right Associations, and Catholic Emancipation Associations, and later on, Repeal organisations, Fenianism and Home Rule and Land League, all had the Ribbon Society in touch, consciously or not, eager to forward any movement of violence and unrest.

Its main weapons were intimidation based upon outrage and assassination. If a man thought he was aggrieved and wanted to have his enemy murdered or beaten he went to the parish master of the Ribbon Society and said he wished to have a certain thing done ; he named the sum of money which was to be given for it and the business of the parish master was to appoint the persons to perpetrate the outrage. Very frequently the persons appointed were utterly ignorant of the person whom they went to kill or beat. These crimes and those of the Carders, of Captain Rock and the Terry Alts, produced great demoralization in the minds of the people throughout the country. Perjury was rampant. The taking of human life was not considered a crime. Juries would not find a verdict on the evidence. The whole framework of established law was set aside and violence put in its place.

It must be said of the Repeal movement that O'Connell set his face against all crime as an aid to his agitation ; nevertheless, all the secret societies benefited by—and used—it to encourage their followers generally in the national sentiment. O'Connell's policy was superseded by the Young Ireland Party, which advocated the ideas of John Mitchel and James Fintan Lalor, who represented the physical force party of 1848. These men carried on the policy of Wolfe Tone, Robert Emmet and the men of 1798, and had their backing amongst the revolutionaries of their generation. Mr. Smith O'Brien's rising was quelled by Irish police at Ballingarry, and ended in a fiasco and the exile of its leaders.

When Repeal failed as a national cry the Fenian conspiracy was set on foot a few years after 1848 by two men who were

deeply implicated in that attempt at rebellion—James Stephens and John O'Mahony. Stephens made Paris his centre, and O'Mahony directed his energies amongst the Irish in America. The conspiracy was thirteen years in growth until at last it burst out in 1865. The Civil War in America had intervened, and was a source of great advantage to the conspirators, as American-Irish regiments were formed in both North and South and it was hoped to enlist them afterwards in Ireland for revolutionary purposes. All that came from America was money, which was spent lavishly by Stephens in Paris and in Ireland upon paper organization. The methods were a variant of all the old secret societies, local centres, the swearing in of members, secret drilling and much military talk. The rising in 1865 was however an ignominious fiasco in the field, though there were a few assassinations to punish traitors. But the dynamite outrages which followed in 1867 were more successful.

The plan of campaign was to attack England, and it began with the murder of Sergeant Brett, who was killed by armed Fenians in a raid on a prisoners' van in Manchester. The van was held up in broad daylight, and the prisoners were rescued and escaped. Three men were executed for this audacious crime and were known in Ireland as ' The Manchester Martyrs.' Very shortly after came the dynamite outrage in London, which resulted in the blowing up of the Clerkenwell House of Detention. The explosion was heard all over London and resulted in the death of twelve people and the wounding of 120 innocent persons who lived on the opposite side of the street in crowded tenements. A few days after in Cork eight Fenians entered the shop of a gunsmith in broad daylight and without the slightest opposition in a crowded thoroughfare gathered up sixty revolvers with 1,500-lbs. of gunpowder, and walked off with their plunder.

This was the first dynamite campaign, conceived in America and carried out by agents in England of the Fenian Brotherhood, intent upon an endeavour to retrieve their damaged character for revolutionary prowess. But the Irish at home had temporarily had enough of the physical force party. Grievances had been met by England. The Irish Church had been disestablished. Mr. Gladstone had passed the Land Act of 1870—the first of many. In the same year a Peace Preservation Act was passed, which dealt with Ribbonism; the country became quiet and

anxious for peace. For the next few years the Irish at home turned to their farms, disgusted with the non-success of Fenianism. Not so the American-Irish. Mr. Parnell appeared on the scene in the new Parliament of 1874, and five years after was acclaimed the leader of the first revolutionary movement based upon the land question. It was called the Land League, and was founded in 1879 by two men, both ex-Fenians, convicted for treason and felony in 1867—John Devoy in America, and Michael Davitt in Ireland. In 1880 Mr. Parnell made a tour in America, accompanied by Mr. John Dillon, M.P., to raise funds for carrying on the new agitation. He was hailed with joy in the big cities of America, and made such speeches as satisfied the physical force party in the States that he was no mere land reformer, but in favour of the ultimate separation of Ireland from England. The climax came at a meeting in Cincinnati on February 23rd 1880 when the new leader used the following words :—

'When we have undermined English mis-government we have paved the way for Ireland to take her place amongst the nations of the earth. And let us not forget that that is the ultimate goal at which all we Irishmen aim. *None of us—whether we be in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be—will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England.*'

The old Irish methods of assassination and outrage were taken up with enthusiasm. To it was added Mr. Parnell's patent device of what is now known as 'boycotting,' so called after the attempt to isolate and starve out Captain Boycott, an English gentleman who was a land agent in the Co. Mayo. All the old secret societies revived under the extensive propaganda of Davitt's friends in America, and the exertions of the Dublin Nationalist press. The Land League was in close touch with them, for it had accepted the heritage of the Whiteboys, the Ribbonmen and their imitators in America known as the Molly Maguires. The Parnellite anti-rent agitation was the stalking-horse of the old physical force party, which soon showed its readiness to use its old methods. The same terrorism and lawlessness as was used in 1831-2 in the tithe-war reappeared, and worse followed.

Some official figures show the fruits of the Land League teaching. In 1879, the year it was started, the agrarian crimes were 870; in 1880 they rose to 2,585; in 1881 they rose to 4,439. Such was the coercion practised by Nationalist tyrants and law-breakers in Ireland by murder, outrage and boycotting.

In their first duty of restoring order Mr. Gladstone's Government on July 12th 1882, passed the Crimes Act, a measure substituting the coercion of law for the coercion of the law-breakers. It fulfilled its design completely for the period for which it was enacted. In the year 1883 agrarian crimes fell to 834; in 1884 they fell to 744; from January to June they fell to 373. The Crimes Act expired in July 1885 and immediately a rise took place in agrarian crime until the introduction of the Criminal Law and Procedure Act again had the desired effect: the establishment of liberty to live a free life under the law. It is needless to say the Parnellites did their utmost to prevent this legislation from passing, but with no success.

In the Parnellite period the worst case of assassination—though less horrible than that recently perpetrated on Sunday 21st November 1920, in Dublin—was the infamous Phœnix Park murder on May 6th 1882, when a band of desperadoes killed Lord Frederick Cavendish, just appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Mr. Thomas Burke the Under Secretary. This dreadful deed took place only four days after the release of Mr. Parnell and Mr. Davitt from jail under the famous arrangement with the Gladstone Government called the Kilmainham Treaty. It had an extraordinary effect upon public opinion, and was recognized as the work of the left wing of the Fenian party, from whom the weapons were obtained in America. The conspiracy was laid bare, however, by an informer, and justice was executed upon the leaders.

We now come to another and more serious dynamite campaign directed against London and other cities in 1883. It was undoubtedly plotted in America by the same extreme section of the Fenian Brotherhood, or as they now called themselves the Clan-na-Gael. It was meant as an attempt to intimidate the British public and attract attention to the danger of incurring the vengeance of transatlantic conspirators—possibly also to revenge the execution of the Phœnix Park assassins. The first attempt was made in the evening of March 16th 1883, when a terrific explosion was heard in Whitehall. London was seriously alarmed. No lives, however, were lost, and the damage was confined to the ground floor wall of the Local Government Board offices. A similar attempt was made the same night to blow up the offices of the *Times*, then a staunch Unionist paper (*quantum*

mutatus), but it failed by a lucky accident. The vessel holding the dynamite refused to explode. Sir W. Harcourt immediately introduced a bill, which was rushed through Parliament, giving fresh powers for dealing with dynamite outrages. They continued to occur at intervals for some time, despite the fact that three of the conspirators were arrested and received life sentences.

At the end of the year attempts were made to destroy something more valuable than bricks and mortar. On the evening of October 30th, 1883, just as the Underground Railways were most crowded, two attempts were made simultaneously to wreck the trains. The first explosion at Charing Cross was a failure. Only one old lady and two men were knocked down ; a hole was made in the wall of the tunnel, and there was much smoke and noise. The Praed Street explosion was more successful. A bomb caught a passing train, shattering six crowded carriages. Five men were so badly injured that they were taken direct to hospital ; while thirty more required hospital treatment later on.

There was a pause for the new year, when on February 26th 1884, an attack was made on Victoria Station. A bag containing an explosive machine was deposited in the cloak-room of the London & Brighton Station, at 8 p.m., a very crowded time. The machine, happily, failed to explode for several hours, through some defect. By the time it exploded very few people were in the station, and no lives were lost, nor any one hurt. But the cloak-room, the booking office, and one of the waiting-rooms were completely wrecked. It was subsequently discovered that similar parcels of dynamite had been deposited at Charing Cross and Praed Street, but the mechanism had failed to operate. Later it was discovered that a fourth bomb had been laid at Ludgate Hill Station, which also failed.

Again a few months elapsed before two fresh attempts were made simultaneously; the then objectives were Scotland Yard (the home of the police) and the Junior Carlton Club, Pall Mall. The explosion in Scotland Yard was of little importance. Two carriages in the Yard were smashed, and one horse and driver were seriously injured ; but only some walls and windows of the office were injured. In St. James' Square, on which the club backs, the attack was more serious. Dynamite had been placed in two areas, and the basements suffered most. A large number

of female servants were at work, but only a few were seriously hurt. A barmaid at a neighbouring public-house was also a sufferer from broken glass. These results did not in any way satisfy the hopes of the dynamitards, and London grew calm again.

The police, however, had information that there was a stock of dynamite left in England, and a factory run by the Fenians was discovered in Birmingham. At the end of September an attempt was made to blow up the Council House at Salisbury, but the damage done was slight. A similar attempt was made at the end of November, when the Town Hall of Royton, near Oldham, was considerably injured by a dynamite explosion. No one was hurt. A race meeting at Houghton-le-Spring had a lucky escape in October 1884. A few days after the fixture, some boys wandered under the grand stand and there found a tin containing sixteen charges of dynamite. The charges were wrapped in copper wire and a fuse partially burnt was attached. Bearing in mind the attempts in London on the railways and stations the inference is irresistible. The diabolical design was to blow up the grand stand when crowded with spectators and produce a sensation unexampled in the annals of terrorism.

From what has been recorded it is clear what an active part the transatlantic conspiracy took in the Nationalist manœuvring in Parliament and on the platform. But the dynamitards had not yet done. They had had many failures ; some big thing must be attempted. Towards the end of 1884 a gang attempted to blow up London Bridge. It was a daring deed, but the men who were concerned suffered most themselves. Three of them on December 13th 1884 dropped down the ebbing stream in a small boat carrying a heavy parcel wrapped in sacking—so the boatman said, whose boat they hired. About half an hour after a tremendous explosion shook the bridge and the houses on both sides of the river. It was another failure. The bridge held. Of the conspirators two were blown up, ' hoist with their own petard,' and one, it is believed, survived.

The new year opened with a still more serious and dramatic episode. On Saturday January 24th 1885, a man was seen carrying a black bag in the crypt at Westminster Hall, from which smoke was issuing. The cry of dynamite was raised, and a policeman named Cole seized the bag and carried it up from the

crypt to the hall, until the heat compelled him to drop it. Directly it touched the ground it exploded with a terrific noise, and the hall was filled with clouds of dust and the floor covered with broken glass. The gallant Cole escaped with his life. Within a few minutes another interior explosion rang from the House of Commons. Being Saturday, the House was practically empty, only two visitors being in it. No one was hurt, but there was a dreadful spectacle of wrecked furniture and equipment. The partition between the bar and the rest of the House was smashed to bits. Strong oak benches were shivered into splinters. A gaping hole had been blasted in the floor. The Treasury Bench suffered severely, and the seat usually occupied by Mr. Gladstone showed ugly gashes.

In the City, almost at the same moment, the Tower of London was attacked. The show-rooms were thronged with people, and under this convenient cover the conspirators concealed a large quantity of dynamite in the banqueting hall. The explosion that occurred was terrific, and the crowds of visitors were horror-stricken by the awful din and the flames that subsequently broke out. Happily, only two young women and two little boys were injured, so that the conspirators were baulked of the bloodshed they had anticipated.

It is difficult to speak calmly of the dynamite outrages. They have quite recently been revived and repeated; happily without much loss of life. The recent explosions, however, in Liverpool are estimated to have resulted in thousands of pounds damage to property. These acts of modern inhumanity are attacks on the framework of society, and are meant to be so. They represent such a complete disregard for the sufferings and lives of the public, that they can only be met by the severest punishment it is possible to inflict. A few years after the dynamite campaign above described the Parnellite party headed an amnesty movement in favour of the convicted dynamiters who had served part of their sentence. This was no doubt prompted by a regard for their supporters in America, and is an excellent hint of the close intimacy of the constitutional Home Rule party with the Extremists in America and at home, as regards the ultimate aim of the great conspiracy against the British Empire. The use of bombs by the Sinn Fein party in taking innocent life shows how exactly reproduced are the methods of the old dynamiters of 1883-5.

There can be little doubt that Mr. Gladstone's nerve was much affected by the dynamite outrages. His Government went out of office in 1885, and was succeeded by Lord Salisbury's administration for some six months. Then came the great change in Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, and the formation of the Unionist party, and their entry into office in 1886. During the life of Lord Salisbury's Government, Mr. Balfour, as Chief Secretary, restored law and order, in spite of every species of malicious abuse and journalistic extravagance in the Irish press. Malefactors had found their master, and they knew it. The Irish race is a dangerous one ever to run away from. Mr. Balfour never ran away from rebels, and they admired him for his courage. Mr. Birrell ran away and they despised him. Mr. Gladstone returned to office in 1893, and the Irish members insisted on another Home Rule Bill, and again it was defeated on an appeal to the country, letting in Lord Salisbury's party for a ten-years' lease of power. At the end of that period in 1906 when Mr. Campbell Bannerman became Premier, he found Ireland peaceful and prosperous. Mr. Birrell as Chief Secretary confessed it in words of praise and satisfaction. But there was a dangerous cloud brooding in the horizon which grew blacker and blacker as the years went on.

The first years of the new century brought a new phase of Irish unrest. Hitherto the war upon English ideas and English government had gone hand in hand with secret conspiracy and crime. There now came a period of an open socialistic revolution by armed physical forces. For its first inspiration, curiously enough, we must go back fifty years to the time when Karl Marx lived in London, from whence he directed the Socialist propaganda, together with one, Eugène Dupont, a Frenchman. Marx, in a letter to his colleagues in Geneva, dated 1 January 1870, laid down the following propositions :—(1) England is the only country in which a real socialistic revolution can be made ; (2) The English people cannot make this revolution ; (3) Foreigners must make it for them ; (4) The foreign members, therefore, must retain their seats on the London Board ; (5) The point to strike on first is Ireland, and in Ireland they are ready to begin their work. Reasons for these statements are given :—

' These English have all the materials for a socialistic revolution ; what they lack are the generalising spirit and the revolutionary fire. . . . The only point where we can strike the great blow against official England is on Irish soil. In Ireland the movement is made a hundred

times more easy for us by the two prime facts that the social question is that of rent, and that the people are more revolutionary and exasperated than the English. The position of the International in face of the Irish question is very clear. Our first care is to push the revolution in England. To this end we must strike the first blow in Ireland.'

It is a strange fact that, after fifty years, Karl Marx found a disciple in James Connolly, who attempted to carry his idea of making Ireland the starting point of the social revolution in England, and died in the attempt in the rising of 1916. Connolly, it is claimed, was Ireland's first Socialist martyr. He was the first enthusiastic believer in Wolfe Tone and the United Irishmen in the eighteenth century, whom the French Revolution had inspired with the watchwords: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. His career began in 1896, when he founded the first definitely Socialist organisation in Dublin. Connolly and the Irish Socialist Republican Party were the first to give Irish workers a definite and class-conscious Socialist organisation, and from that date the propaganda on a Marxian basis, with a strong infusion of Bolshevism, has been continuous and persistent. By degrees it practically converted the Sinn Fein Party to its methods. Strikes became a new feature in Ireland under a militant unionism. In 1909 Larkin founded in Dublin the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union, with an organ in the press called the *Irish Worker*. To-day we see the result of this union's propaganda in the railway strike in Ireland, which has reduced the country to chaos. Happily this gigantic undertaking has proved its own undoing, and even Nationalist papers are denouncing it.

Connolly arrived in Dublin in 1910, after a visit to America, and joined Larkin's Labour republican movement. From that date it slipped rapidly down an inclined plane until, joined by the Irish Nationalist Volunteers during the war, all became involved in the Rebellion of 1916. Since then the Sinn Fein movement has proceeded on parallel lines with, and adopted the principles of, Connolly's republican army. There can be little doubt that all the 'war operations' of the rebels have been mainly carried out by the extreme men in the ranks of the republican brotherhoods, who, in their turn, have been financed by American-Irish extremists, who have treated De Valera as they treated Parnell. De Valera and Griffiths have been the office-keepers of the

movement, and can hardly be said to be anything else at present. They are totally distinct from men like Connolly, who were prepared to die for an idea, however impossible. They are akin to the Girondins, and thus attracted the bulk of the old Nationalist Party after its decay and final disappearance at the General Election of 1918. The violent extremists who are responsible for the present campaign of political murder are, by their own admissions in the pamphlet 'Ireland at Berne,' in full sympathy with the International Conference held in February 1919, and in fraternal alliance with the Russian Soviet Government. Karl Marx's vision is fulfilled. Mr. Gladstone's phrase, 'marching through rapine to the disintegration of the 'Empire' is no exaggeration as a description of the aims and objects of the Irish revolutionists, whose revolvers and bombs are ruling a nation of slaves cringing under the coercion of the law-breakers. Mr. Richard Dawson's recent volume on the whole of this new development is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

As a contrast with the hideous tyranny imposed upon Ireland by a gang of revolutionaries it is sufficient to append the picture of Ireland in 1915 as drawn by Mr. John Redmond in a speech delivered at an Australian banquet :—

'To-day the people, broadly speaking, own the soil; to-day the labourers live in decent habitations; to-day there is absolute freedom in the local government and the local taxation of the country; to-day we have the widest Parliamentary and municipal franchise. . . . So far as the town tenants are concerned, we have passed for Ireland an Act whereby they are protected against arbitrary eviction, and are given compensation not only for disturbance from their homes, but for the goodwill of the business they had created—a piece of legislation far in advance of anything obtained for the town tenants of England; I may add, far in advance of any legislation obtained for the town tenants of any other country. We know that we have at last won educational freedom in university education for most of the youth of Ireland. . . . To-day we have a system of old age pensions in Ireland whereby every old man and woman over seventy is saved from the workhouse, free to spend their last days in comparative comfort.'

This declaration of the late leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party is a sufficient answer to our calumniators on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

PHILIP H. BAGENAL.

IRELAND THE ENEMY

1. Ireland in the European System. Vol. I. 1500-1557. By JAMES HOGAN. Longmans, Green. 1920.
2. Ireland: An Enemy of the Allies? By R. G. ESCOUFLAIRE. John Murray. 1919.
3. Labour in Irish History. By JAMES CONNOLLY. Dublin: Maunsel. 1917.

IT is one of the characteristics of English people—whether it be a strength or a weakness is hard to say—that they forget past animosities with strange rapidity. Within a few weeks or a few years, according to the nature of the case, they forget any struggle, however fierce, in which they may have been involved and are quite willing to treat their previous enemies as bosom friends. Some Englishmen rather flatter themselves that this forgetfulness represents a highly developed spirit of Christian forgiveness; more probably it is due to the instinct of the practical man that it is better to get on with the work of the present than to burden one's mind with the woes of the past. That instinct necessarily develops a defective memory, with the result that our enemies of the past are in effect forgiven because they are forgotten. In many ways this practical instinct has served England well; it has enabled her to get on with her work in the world while other countries were crying over spilt milk. But it serves her badly when she has to deal with a people who live on memories, or upon fanciful presentations of past facts.

Such a people are the Irish. The average Irishman can never forget the past—or what he has been taught to believe about the past. His mental pictures of what happened six centuries or four centuries or two centuries ago are more real to him than the palpable facts of to-day. The average Englishman simply cannot understand this mentality. Having forgotten everything about the past—except perhaps some schoolboy reminiscences of King Alfred and the cakes, or Queen Elizabeth and the courtier's cloak—the average Englishman finds it impossible to believe that anybody can live in the past. And that is the final reason why England never understands Ireland and never will.

Further, Englishmen suffer from a common inclination to assume that their country is in the wrong whenever it comes into conflict with any other country. This characteristic is probably in its origin nothing but an exaggerated development of the love of fair-play ; but the development has proceeded so far that many otherwise level-headed persons never seem to be happy unless they are giving their own side out. This temperament largely explains the pro-German movement which flourished in our midst even during the Great War ; it is also one of the factors which accounts for the very widespread English view that England is responsible for the troubles of Ireland.

Those Englishmen who have accepted this view may be strongly recommended to read a book on Ireland by M. Escouflaire, one of the few Frenchmen who have troubled to make a personal study of that country and its alleged wrongs. M. Escouflaire's book first appeared in French with the title ' L'Irlande Ennemie ? ' An English translation was published in 1919 with the modified title ' Ireland : An Enemy of the ' Allies ? ' The keynote to the book is struck in the first line of the preface : ' The Irish question is an international imposture.' M. Escouflaire goes on to say that ' before the war opinion in ' Latin countries inclined towards the small complaining nation ' and suspected ' England, the silent, who is such a bad defender ' of her own cause.' He himself in earlier years shared the popular belief throughout the world about the wrongs of Ireland ; it was only when he had studied Irish history and investigated contemporary facts, and ' weighed words and deeds in the ' balance ' that he decided to expose Irish pretences.

One of the most useful features of the book is its recital of the repeated attempts made by England to kill Irish enmity by kindness. He quotes for example from a speech made by Sir Robert Peel in 1845 when proposing that a parliamentary grant should be provided—mainly out of the pockets of English and Scotch Protestants—for the establishment of a Roman Catholic seminary at Maynooth. In defending this proposal Peel said :—

' I say you must break up, in some way or other, that formidable confederacy which exists in that country against the British Government and the British connection. I do not believe you can break it up by force. . . . You can do much to break it up by acting in a spirit of kindness, forbearance and generosity ' (p. 72).

How many times since 1845 has similar language been used by English statesmen with similar results? Take for one example the events that followed the passing of the Land Act of 1881. This Act put Irish tenants in a better position than agricultural tenants in any part of the world. It gave them not merely reasonable security of tenure, but part ownership of the land, subject to the payment of a moderate rent fixed by authority. It was a free gift of a valuable property which the tenant was free to sell—and often did sell—for a large sum of money. Yet the passing of this Act—which its authors believed would buy permanent peace in Ireland—was followed by fresh agitation on the part of men who were determined that there should be no peace between Ireland and England.

Many English people and many of England's American critics apparently believe that Ireland's hatred of England is due to the Act of Union and would be dissipated by the establishment of some form of Home Rule. That belief implies complete ignorance of Irish history. One of the worst of the many Irish rebellions—worse, at any rate, than any that has since occurred—was the rebellion of 1798, when Ireland had an independent parliament of her own. That parliament, it is true, did not represent the general body of the Irish people. Nor at that time, it must be remembered, did the parliament of Great Britain represent the people of Great Britain. Both parliaments in the main represented nothing but the dominant caste of the day; both were largely filled with members nominated by the owners of pocket boroughs. In Ireland, however, there was this important distinction, that the dominant caste was alien to the mass of the people. It consisted of colonists of English and, to a smaller extent, of Scottish origin. These colonists owned the land and ruled the country; they were intensely hated by their Irish serfs. During its brief existence of eighteen years the independent parliament of Ireland, generally known as Grattan's parliament, was constantly engaged in passing Coercion Acts. The Lord Chancellor of Ireland, the Earl of Clare, speaking in the Irish House of Lords on February 10, 1800 in support of the proposed Union, said:—

'Session after session have you been compelled to enact laws of unexampled rigour and novelty to repress the horrible excesses of the mass of your people; and the fury of murder and pillage and desolation

have so outrun all legislative exertion, that you have been at length driven to the hard necessity of breaking down the pale of municipal law, and putting your country under the ban of military government.'

It was against the government which rested upon Grattan's parliament that the rebellion of 1798 was directed, and it was because that parliament had so egregiously failed that the Act of Union was passed. The purpose of that Act was to establish a common parliament for the two islands of Great Britain and Ireland, which should be strong enough to secure peace and establish justice. The native Irish had no interest in Grattan's parliament, and the Irish Catholic priesthood welcomed its disappearance. Yet such is the peculiar temperament of the Irish people that within little more than a generation after the passing of the Act of Union, they began to regard this Anglo-Irish Protestant parliament, against which the native Irish had rebelled, as a great Irish national institution which had been crushed by the tyranny of England.

To some extent it must be admitted that this confusion of mind and memory is partly due to a confusion of words. The word ' Irish ' has long been and still is frequently used to denote two quite distinct peoples : first, the native Irish people, mainly Celtic in origin and almost exclusively Catholic in religion ; secondly, the English colonists in Ireland. The latter often called themselves Irish because they had made their homes on Irish soil, but they retained the racial characteristics of Englishmen, which were intensified, as frequently happens, by contact with an alien race. Of this double use of the word Irish a striking illustration is to be found in the speech of the Earl of Clare above referred to. Describing the situation as it then was, he said :—

' Look to the number of Irish emigrants who now crowd every village in Great Britain, and have been driven to seek an asylum there from the brutal fury of the Irish people and the cold-blooded treachery of their own domestics, palpably fomented and encouraged by Irish faction and Irish treason.'

It will be seen that in this single sentence the one word ' Irish ' is used to denote two separate peoples : the Anglo-Irish and the Native Irish, although these two peoples are in the same sentence described as being at such bitter war with one another that one race had to flee to Great Britain to escape from the fury of the

other. It was the Anglo-Irish who filled and controlled Grattan's parliament, and for the most part these Anglo-Irish regarded the native Irish much in the same way that English colonists in America regarded the native Americans—otherwise known as Red Indians. Yet for the greater part of the nineteenth century Irish politicians representing the native Irish have spoken as if the abolition of Grattan's parliament had been a wrong done by England to the native population of Ireland.

A better appreciation of the real facts of the case is shown by the modern school of Irish socialists, who combine the Irishman's hatred of England with the socialist's contempt for parliamentarians. Of this school James Connolly, who was executed for the part he played in the rebellion of 1916, was one of the leaders. In a book called 'Labour in Irish History,' which was not published till about a year after his death, he pours scorn upon the favourite pretence of Irish Nationalist politicians that the disappearance of Grattan's parliament was an injury to Ireland. In well-argued pages he shows that the temporary wave of prosperity which Ireland did enjoy during the brief life-time of that parliament 'was almost solely due to the 'introduction of mechanical power and the consequent cheapening 'of manufactured goods.' He goes on to point out that the subsequent application of steam to machinery gave England and Scotland, with their plentiful supplies of coal, a necessary advantage over Ireland. Dealing further with this long current Irish fiction that the Act of Union imposed some economic injustice upon Ireland, he says :—

> 'The fact that the Union placed all Irish manufactures upon an absolutely equal basis legally with the manufactures of England is usually ignored or, worse still, is so perverted in its statement as to leave the impression that the reverse is the case. In fact many thousands of our countrymen still believe that English laws prohibit mining in Ireland after certain minerals and the manufacture of certain articles' (p. 45).

In passing it may be noticed that Connolly's contemptuous reference to the legend that 'English laws prohibit mining in 'Ireland' has not prevented other Irish revolutionaries from continuing to spread that fiction throughout the world. Thus De Valera writing in the *Boston American*—which is described by itself as 'a paper for people who think'—says, under date

September 19, 1919 that there are extensive coalfields in Ireland, but that permission to work them is refused ' because England ' wants to preserve for her coal lords the profitable Irish market.' As the passage just quoted from Connolly honestly indicates, there is not a particle of truth in this statement by De Valera. It is one of the myriads of legends that Irishmen have set themselves to invent in order to justify to themselves and to the world their never-ending hatred of England.

That hatred is due to racial incongruities, aggravated by religious disagreement. These factors alone are sufficient to account for a good deal of mutual dislike. But the spirit of hate in Ireland has been fed with fresh fuel from generation to generation by little groups of fanatics who have made it their mission to teach that loyalty to Ireland means enmity to England. In one sense these apostles of hatred are right. For through many centuries there has been no possibility of any common national feeling in Ireland, except a common hatred of some foreign country, and the most obvious foreign country for that purpose is England.

The connection of England with Ireland began in the middle of the twelfth century. At that time England was ruled by a French king ; Ireland was divided into a multitude of principalities or chieftainships, always at war with one another. In 1155 the French king of England received a grant of the government of Ireland from the Pope of Rome, subject to the obligation to pay Peter's pence for Irish hearths. In the following year King Henry II., then in Aquitaine, was invited by one of the Irish princes to send troops to assist him in his wars with another Irish prince. Four years later Strongbow went to Waterford and thereafter the kings of England had a footing in Ireland. But for centuries the Irish continued to follow their own ways : fighting incessantly with one another as well as with the Anglo-Norman or English invaders. Henry VIII. was the first king of England who made any consistent efforts to reduce Ireland to order. The relationship of Ireland to England in his reign has been historically examined by a recent writer, Mr. James Hogan, Professor of History at University College, Cork. His book is interesting, not merely for the picture it gives of past history but for the light it throws on the present mentality of the southern Irish.

Mr. Hogan takes no pains to conceal his anti-English animus. For example, in his introduction (p. xxvi.) he says that 'the policy 'which has governed English relations with Ireland from Tudor 'times to the present day' may be summarised in two propositions. These propositions are in his own words :—

(1). That the security of England renders necessary the conquest of Ireland.

(2). That the only way to keep the Irish permanently impotent is to exterminate them.

Thus an Irish professor of history deliberately asserts that the extermination of the Irish has been part of the policy of England from 'Tudor times to the present day.' This may help Englishmen to understand why peace between England and Ireland is impossible. It may be true that on several occasions in the past many Englishmen, driven to indignation by the incessant rebellions and never-ending guerilla warfare in Ireland, have impatiently exclaimed that the only way to settle the Irish question was to exterminate the lot. Professor Hogan quotes Sir William Drury as writing somewhat to this effect in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. But to say that this has been the deliberate policy of England from the sixteenth century to the present day is palpably and wickedly untrue.

We need go no further back than the Act of Union. That Act was intended to admit all Irishmen to membership of the United Kingdom and of the British Empire on terms of absolute equality with Englishmen and Scotsmen. Within less than fifty years after the passing of that Act the population of Ireland had almost doubled. Then came the Irish potato famine. English money was poured into Ireland to save the Irish from starvation, and the commercial system of England was hastily altered by the abolition of the Corn Laws in order to facilitate the supply of foreign wheat to the starving Irish people. In the past sixty or seventy years millions of money have been spent out of the British Exchequer to assist the development of agriculture and commerce and fishing in Ireland. Are those the methods that Great Britain would pursue if her policy were to exterminate the Irish people ?

It is true that since 1850 the population of Ireland has fallen back to about the figure that it was in 1800. The explanation is sufficiently indicated in the passage above quoted from the

writings of James Connolly. Devoid of coal, Ireland must be mainly an agricultural country, and throughout the world agricultural populations tend to decline, and urban populations to grow. Finding no sufficient opportunity of employment on their own farms Irishmen have emigrated to the towns of England, Scotland and America. The agricultural population that remains in Ireland is probably more prosperous than any other agricultural population in Europe.

The fact that Professor Hogan can so falsely mis-state the policy of England does not however destroy the value of his book. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* The book, which is attractively written, deals mainly with the first fifty years of the sixteenth century and shows in detail how the different Irish principalities—' nations ' they frequently called themselves—were constantly intriguing with continental powers against England. Thus, in his introduction, Professor Hogan writes :—

' The first fifty years of the sixteenth century is filled with negotiations between Irish chieftains and Continental princes. Again and again during those years the Irish appealed for military assistance to France, Scotland and the Empire ; and we find Irishmen moving through the great events of the century as easily as if they had been brought up in the Italian or French schools of politics. . . . Every year the negotiations of the Irish with France increased in number and importance, and, although they produced no permanent military benefits for the Irish nation, yet they have a profound significance—for they register the rising temper of the nation, the hardening of the national will against the enemy.' (p. xxix.)

And again in the concluding pages of his book he says :—

' Withal, the French and Irish lived on terms of friendship, and there can be no doubt that Frenchmen were full of the kindliest intentions towards their friends. This continual political intercourse with France was not without important results. It served to bring Ireland into the horizon of Continental states as an excellent basis for operations against England.' (p. 218.)

It will be interesting to Frenchmen to read this gracious acknowledgment of the services which France rendered to the cause of Irish nationalism in the sixteenth century, and to set it side by side with the conduct of Irish nationalists in the twentieth century when France was fighting for her life. But Professor Hogan has apparently come to the conclusion that Ireland can now dispense with France ; for in another passage, referring to

the Earl of Desmond as the first of Irish chieftains 'to understand 'the necessity for common action against England,' he says (p. xxix.) that Desmond also held :—

'in common with the wisest and most patriotic Irishmen of the century that the Irish could not overthrow English power of their own strength, and that to effect national unity as well as to create an effective military machine it would be necessary to have foreign assistance. From the sixteenth to the nineteenth century this conception of Irish policy remained in force, and not till the twentieth century have the Irish felt strong enough to rely entirely on their own resources.'

The above declaration that the Irish are now strong enough to rely entirely on their own resources has become an article of faith with modern Irishmen—Sinn Fein : Ourselves alone. The boast is characteristic of Irishmen, living as they do partially isolated from the world's currents and protected from external danger by the over-shadowing strength of a great Power. To the inhabitants of most other countries such a boast coming from a section only of the population of a little island will appear mere childish vanity. Nevertheless I venture seriously to urge that the Sinn Fein boast should be accepted at its face value and that the Sinn Feiners should be given full liberty to make it good if they can.

That proposition implies, so far as southern Ireland is concerned, a reversal of the policy followed by England for centuries. From the maritime point of view the islands of Ireland and Great Britain are one geographical unit, and our ancestors were justified in arguing that it would be dangerous to our national security to allow Ireland to pass under a foreign flag. That there is still danger in so doing I do not for a moment deny, but I contend that the danger involved in setting southern Ireland free is less than the danger of continuing to nurture enemies in our own household.

We have tried every possible device for conciliating the southern Irish—they will not be conciliated. They prefer to feed their hatred with legends of ancient sufferings and invented tales of modern wrongs. Many of the ancient legends are undeniably based on fact. No one denies that the Irish peasants suffered much in the past. But so did the peasants in almost every country in the world. In the eighteenth century, though the condition of the Irish peasantry was atrociously bad, it was

not worse than the condition of the peasantry of France and Germany. But whatever the past wrongs of Ireland may have been it is impossible to do business on rational lines with a people whose policy to-day depends on memories and imaginings of what happened generations or centuries ago.

For fifty years past the Irish people have had no wrongs ; on the contrary they have enjoyed a peculiarly favoured position. They have been over-represented in the parliament of the United Kingdom, and have frequently held the balance of power in that parliament and thus have been able largely to control in their own interest the policy of the whole kingdom. Even apart from this control the wishes of Ireland have more than once determined the policy of Great Britain, especially in matters of religion. Reference has already been made to Peel's grant to the Roman Catholic seminary at Maynooth, a grant totally in conflict with contemporary religious sentiment in England and Scotland. An even more striking case is the action of the Liberal Government that came into power in 1906 with regard to the so-called National University of Ireland. One of the main issues in the election of 1906 was the controversy over denominational schools. The majority of Liberals then elected were definitely pledged to oppose denominational teaching at public expense. Yet one of the first things done by the Liberal Government was to establish an avowedly denominational university in Ireland. This Roman Catholic university, endowed with public money, mainly contributed by Protestant taxpayers, has become one of the chief centres for training young Irishmen in the faith of Sinn Fein.

In addition to the power which Irishmen possess to influence and frequently to control the British parliament, the Irish have a complete system of local self-government based upon popular election. They have in fact for a full generation possessed constitutional powers of self-government to the same extent as Frenchmen or Germans or Americans, and in addition they have enjoyed the luxury of receiving lavish subsidies provided by English and Scottish taxpayers. On this particular question of finance which has given rise to many well-advertised Irish fictions, it is sufficient here to state that during all the period that has elapsed since the passing of the Act of Union—with the possible exception of some four or five years—the people of Ireland have either been taxed at lower rates than the people of England and

Scotland, or else have contributed on balance to the common exchequer less than their fair share.

The experience of the past seventy years has clearly proved that Peel's policy of trying to win Ireland by kindness and generosity—a policy repeated decade after decade by his successors—fails hopelessly. Every fresh concession to Ireland only intensifies her enmity—possibly because it justifies her contempt. By continuing to grant all the rights of British citizenship to these enemies of the Empire we are inflicting a very grave injury not only upon England and Scotland and Ulster, but also upon the self-governing Dominions. In the *National Review* for December last there is an article entitled ' Is Ireland Important ? ' by an Australian writer. The article is well worth the attention of the politicians and writers of the metropolis. The author, Mr. James Edmond, formerly editor of the *Sydney Bulletin*, describes the mischief that Irish voters have wrought in Australian politics, and concludes by urging that the importance of Ireland is exaggerated by Englishmen and that the Empire would be stronger if Irishmen became aliens.

That is also the belief of the present writer, subject to this important proviso, that by Ireland is meant Celtic Ireland only. On no account can we abandon Ulster to her—and to our—enemies. The people of Ulster are people of our own race ; they share our views of life and loyalty ; they have stood by us : we must stand by them. The distinctive merit of the Home Rule Act of 1920 is that, alone of all the Home Rule measures with which parliament has played since 1886, it recognises that Ulster is not Ireland, and refuses to permit the southern Irish in the name of ' self-determination ' to impose their rule upon the Ulster people. By the Act of 1920 Ulster obtains the power to set up a parliament of her own. She did not ask for that power, but she will be wise to use it for her self-protection if the southern Irish are permitted to retain their British citizenship. For as long as southern Ireland remains within the Empire, Irish voters throughout Great Britain will be ever intriguing to do mischief both to England and to Ulster.

Again and again English parties have modified their policy solely to win Irish votes. The Labour Party is at this moment eagerly touting for Irish votes in every constituency and is prepared to sacrifice almost any national or imperial interest to secure those votes. If southern Ireland were made independent

we should be entitled to treat these Irishmen as aliens, unless they formally and explicitly repudiated their Irish nationality. From another point of view the concession of complete independence to southern Ireland would weaken the power for mischief which Irish voters in the United States now possess. They could not continue to pretend that England was a bloodthirsty tyrant when the Ireland which they represent had become a sovereign nation.

The military danger involved in the concession of independence to southern Ireland lies in the possibility that an enemy would use Irish harbours as submarine bases. But would this danger really be much greater if southern Ireland were a foreign country than it is now? Would it be at all greater than under any of the proposed systems, such as Dominion Home Rule, for granting to the southern Irish the reality of independence, combined with the pretence of imperial unity? During the Great War the Irish coasts required constant watching by the British navy; it is not easy to see that they would require much more watching if this little Irish nation—with less than half the population of London—had its own flag and its own navy. On the contrary, if southern Ireland were a foreign country and ventured on any hostile act while we were at war with another Power, we should at once declare war upon our Irish enemies and use whatever power was needed to crush them into submission.

As matters stand our Irish enemies are in effect free to carry on war against us without any fear of a real response. During the Great War they constantly aided German submarines; in 1916 they organised open rebellion. All that happened was that a few of the leaders were shot; the rest, after being condemned to prison for life were most of them released within a year to begin again. Since the Great War the Sinn Feiners have been avowedly engaged in carrying on a new war against England by their own peculiar methods of waylaying individual policemen with an overwhelming force and remorselessly killing them. Month after month these murders went on, but until the police began to retaliate on their assassins, scarcely a word was said about the matter by the bulk of the English press or by the majority of English politicians. Then there arose an outcry, not against the original murderers, but against the police for taking the law into their own hands when the government which they serve failed to defend them.

This reluctance of the general public and of the government to meet war with war in Ireland, is ultimately due to the ever-persistent delusion that it is possible to win Irish peace with English kindness. We are as a nation so much in love with our own habit of loose thinking that we cannot bring ourselves to realise that people who live under our flag, people who share with us on equal terms all the advantages which the protection of that flag brings, are, and always have been, and always will be, our determined enemies. By cutting the knot that ties them to us, and us to them, we should free ourselves from the false sentiment that blinds our judgment, and begin to see the real facts clearly. Perhaps too, our Irish enemies would begin to see some facts to which they now shut their eyes. They might even see that it was worth while to cultivate the friendship of a great and neighbouring Power. But of that we can afford to take the risk. The power for offence possessed by an independent Sinn Fein republic would be insignificant in comparison with the power for retaliation—whether military or commercial—possessed by England, Scotland and Ulster.

That the delimitation of Ulster contained in the Act of 1920 might have to be modified to secure a better geographical frontier is probable. It would no longer be a question of a mere administrative boundary but of a national frontier separating the United Kingdom of England, Scotland and Ulster from the Republic of Ireland. It would also be necessary to allow the inhabitants of the two divisions of the island to make their choice of nationality, and it would be necessary to make provision for facilitating the removal of those inhabitants who would otherwise find themselves isolated among aliens. There are many loyalists in Southern Ireland who have been terrorized into silence by Sinn Fein threats, and who would be glad to escape from Celtic tyranny. It should be part of the compact that these loyalists should be allowed to depart in peace, receiving from the Irish Republic fair compensation for their material losses. Such difficulties as these have to be faced whenever any new national boundaries are formed. They are insignificant in comparison with the difficulties Great Britain and her loyal friends in Ireland will have to face for generations to come both at home and abroad if we continue to retain under the Union flag the determined enemies of England.

EDITOR.

Printed by Roffey & Clark, Croydon.

207

The Edinburgh Review

APRIL, 1921 No. 476

THE AUSTRIAN DERELICT

Economic Conditions in Central Europe (I.) Cd. 521. 1920.

IF the Treaty of Peace made with Germany will justifiably command the wonder of future generations, the Treaty of Peace made with Austria will assuredly evoke their ridicule, and not improbably excite their scorn. The Allies had certainly suffered sufficiently from the aggression of Germany to justify the elaboration, by the best brains at their command, of all conceivable devices to bind her down and make her impotent in future. The work took half a year to draw up ; it was no makeshift and it pleased the hearts of its authors. Unfortunately, the instrument thus created became a precedent and its provisions were applied to the case of Austria, where the conditions were essentially different. Bled white in the war and dismembered by the Armistice, she was called upon to bear all the burdens and submit to all the restrictions aimed at her still powerful ally. The whole elaborate series of exorcisms and incantations was repeated in turn against her. She was bound to make restitution and reparation for all the damage done in the war : she had immediate payments to make and deferred payments, payments in cash and payments in kind. Her army was reduced to a militia and her air force abolished ; while, to complete the picture, though deprived of sea coast and of ships, she was saddled with a Naval Commission of Control ! And now her disastrous plight disturbs the tranquillity of Europe scarcely less than did her former arrogant might.

All rights reserved.

The Allied leaders, indeed, in their dealings with Austria committed a serious mistake in diplomacy : they perpetrated an unintentional infamy—they robbed a corpse. For before ever the Treaty of St. Germain was drawn, and long before it was signed or ratified, their enemy, the Royal and Imperial Austro-Hungarian Empire, had passed away. The loose bonds which had with difficulty maintained an uneasy life in that ramshackle Empire during times of peace, were keenly strained by the outbreak of war and were automatically dissolved as soon as its result became inevitable. Each of the heterogeneous elements which had been fused together into the semblance of an Empire remembered its national individuality and found salvation in the doctrine of self-determination. Not merely did the Slavs, who had always strained at the leash, renounce their allegiance, but the Croats, whose regiments formed the fighting flower of the Imperial armies, and the Bohemians who had manufactured the great Skoda guns, took the same centrifugal cue and proclaimed their independence. They were rewarded by a recognition of their position as Allies and liberated from all liability for the war. In the end, out of an Empire with a population of some 50 millions, and excluding Hungary, with whom no Treaty is yet ratified, all that was left to bear this burden was a province with a population of some six millions. This is the Austria that exists to-day.

Further, of this population, nearly one-third lives in Vienna—a magnificent capital for the old empire but an excrescence and deformity to the little province to which it is now attached. The balance of the people is scattered sparsely over a land of mountains and forests. It is a pleasant enough country, which is well fitted to support a tourist agency and which should rival Switzerland in its attractions for visitors when conditions become more settled : but it cannot afford the luxury of its capital, with which it has no economic connection. It is the same story all round. Austria has still her steel and iron industries, but she has practically no coal. She has excellent pastures for stock but insufficient fodder. She can grow beet, but the sugar-factories are across the borders. It is an artificial creation, which owes its independent existence largely to its worthlessness.

The former prosperity of this people was bound up with the Empire that has been dissolved. And each of the States which have divided up its heritage proceeded at once to build up barriers

against any communion with the new Republic. Their natural resources were not to be allowed to relieve her distress and her financial and commercial experience was not to be allowed to assist in their regeneration. Not only customs duties, but prohibitions, were enforced at all her frontiers: railways were diverted and trade routes closed to assist the process of divorce and disintegration. These short-sighted measures—natural to the fierce spirit of nationalism nurtured by the Peace Conference—destroyed the remaining hope of establishing the financial and economic equilibrium of the new Austria.

The conscience of the world was moved, even at the time of the Armistice, by the tales of tragedy that came from Vienna, and it is to the credit of the Allies that our victory was immediately followed by measures of relief for the starving population. But the extent and the nature of their affliction was not accurately diagnosed, or it would not have been aggravated and perpetuated, as it has been, by the Treaty of St. Germain. Since then, the situation has grown rapidly worse. The crown which was worth nine pence in 1914, and was still worth one penny in 1919, has become practically valueless for foreign purchases—the quotations last January reaching 3,000 for the pound. The country not being able to grow sufficient food to support the population, the Government was forced to import: and as internal prices do not move in ratio to external depreciation, it could only sell at a loss. The result is that the budget shows a deficit of ever increasing dimensions and the national debt expands by milliards every month. And even so the unhappy people would literally have starved before now if it were not that the Allied Powers—while maintaining an organisation at Vienna to collect indemnities—have all the time been providing the credits necessary to sustain the country. The situation is worthy of Alice in Wonderland.

Public attention to the continued chaos in these countries was attracted by a vivid report from Sir William Goode, then British Director of Relief, which was published last year. Sir William Goode was subsequently appointed British Reparation Commissioner at Vienna and as the result of a year's experience in that capacity he recently submitted a further report, which urged the Allied Governments to give up all hope of indemnities and instead to provide systematic credits for an extended period, if they wished to save Austria. The Paris Conference last

January considered this proposal but apparently found it unpalatable. The Allied Governments were, it seems, willing to contemplate some renunciation of their claims, as a means of putting an end to their responsibilities : but if such things as cash or credit were required, Austria must induce Mr. Ter Meulen or some other private capitalist to conjure it up for her. The Conference had the result of nearly doubling the value of the Austrian crown for a few days and to that extent no doubt some private capital was transferred from Allied to Austrian pockets ; but otherwise it left matters much as they were and it certainly did not solve the problem of salving the derelict.

Unfortunately, the responsibilities of the Allied nations are too deeply engaged to enable this problem to be left indeterminate until the day when, to parody Plato, every capitalist is a philanthropist and every philanthropist is a capitalist. The plight of Austria will not admit of delay : a few weeks and it may be too late to save her.

There are four possible alternatives. In the first place, Austria can be supported indefinitely by the Allies, who brought her into existence and have therefore a natural responsibility for her preservation. It is, indeed, due to them, as has already been mentioned, that the new Republic has lasted out these last eighteen months. But the infant is not showing much signs of healthy development and the question is whether, in this hard world, the natural affections of parentage will prevail much longer against the competing claims on the national purse. Austria would indeed be quite content with this solution : she has been reduced to mendicancy, but she is rapidly becoming expert in the art. All she asks is that she may be able to rely on some *permanent* measure of poor relief, instead of having to live from hand to mouth on occasional doles. Such a proposition, however, is not so satisfactory for the Allied Governments. The relief has to be extracted from the pockets of tax-payers who are, at last, showing marked signs of restlessness and have even had some influence on the most spendthrift Government in our history. In view of the unsympathetic treatment they have accorded to the pet schemes of Mr. Fisher and Dr. Addison for the creation of new schools and the compilation of new statistics at home, the Government is not likely to venture on bold measures to save an alien population from starvation. The taxpayers, for

their part, have already done a good deal for Austria and are not sufficiently acquainted with the facts to take any real interest in her fate. Certainly they do not realise that it is rather the Allied policy than Austria that is responsible for the present mess. As similar conditions prevail in all the Allied countries, there is more chance of sympathy than of cash from this quarter : indeed, the tap already shows signs of running dry.

Then, secondly, there is the policy of union with Germany. This policy is not too popular with the Austrians, who are temperamentally very different from the North Germans and who have suffered sufficiently at their hands. It is also anathema to our Allies, who have fixed the boundaries of Germany for all time. But if this alternative presented a real prospect of saving the situation in Austria, as well as of saving the pockets of the tax-payers, there might be something to be said for it. What, however, can Germany offer ? She has neither sufficient food nor sufficient coal, nor sufficient transport for her own domestic needs. At least, so she has protested, times without number, in reply to the exigencies of the Allies ; and she can scarcely tell a different tale now, while their representatives are within earshot, or the disclosure might bring more discomfort to herself than profit to unhappy Austria. Further, in all truth, her ship of State is in none too good trim and rolling about in heavy seas, and it is scarcely equipped to take in tow the derelict lest both go to the bottom together. Perhaps a further malicious inspiration occurs : ' The German-speaking races must inevitably ' reunite, but we need be in no hurry ; it is better to postpone ' the day till the Allies have rehabilitated Austria and thus given ' us an asset, instead of a liability, to incorporate in the Reich.'

The third alternative is to undo, as far as possible, the effects of the Treaty of St. Germain and to build up again something of the Federation that was thereby destroyed. Let the various Succession States retain the independence that is rightly theirs in their domestic affairs, but let them weave together again some measure of co-operation which will restore to Vienna her place as a commercial, financial and intellectual centre for all the Balkan nations. This is the most rational, but at the same time perhaps the most difficult solution. It involves a reversal of the policy embodied in the Peace Treaty, a subsidence of the racial animosities which have been engendered by the war and their

replacement by a mutual confidence and understanding which at present is very far to seek.

If however there is no other possibility, if Austria can no longer count on the support of the Allies, while she is refused assistance by Germany and repudiated by the sister States of the old Empire, there is still one road open. She can find salvation, or at least forgetfulness, in the same way as Russia. Such a course, it may be said at the outset, is most improbable : many factors militate against it and especially the easy-going and indolent temperament of the average Viennese. Bolshevism is, after all, a form of religious mania which depends on the inherent fatalism of the Russian and could not easily take root in a sceptical atmosphere. But starvation is a hard taskmaster, and should the country be permitted to collapse (as in the absence of some organised scheme of reconstruction it will collapse), starvation may yet drive even the tolerant and irresponsible Viennese into some desperate manifestation which we should describe as Bolshevism. That is a possibility which must be reckoned with and it is sufficient of a possibility to deserve consideration by the Allied Governments, who may find that even humanitarian proposals have a business foundation. Central Europe is still in a highly inflammable state, and despite surface conditions an upheaval in Austria—especially an upheaval brought about by intolerable destitution—might well have wide repercussions.

At the present moment, the Austrian people are waiting to know their fate. The Supreme Council, they have been told, is considering what is to be done with them, and they await, without much hope, the result of its deliberations. Meanwhile they are carrying on, much as usual, with a tendency to greater speculation and a growing thirst for Pilsener. The national pride has been so completely broken that it is difficult to discover any positive popular interest in public affairs. The Government is a makeshift which could be overthrown at any moment and which is not in a position to command confidence either at home or abroad. Apathy has taken the place of public spirit. The profiteers who are always ready to turn to advantage their nation's misfortunes, alone succeed in exciting some genuine feeling. To deal with them, the communists from time to time proclaim the day of revolution, but hitherto, when it arrives, they postpone it ; for the police are numerous and admirably

organised. Further, the Succession States still look upon Vienna as an object of envy and the first outbreak of trouble would be a sign for a general concentration upon the capital of their ragged armies. For the moment, the terrible destitution which exists is kept in the background ; food is still obtainable and the *Schleich-handel* (illicit trading) makes a substitute for commerce. The future looks black enough, but sentence of death has not yet been passed and the opera (subsidised by the bankrupt Government) still draws crowded houses.

It is true that in some respects the situation is better than last year. While production remains very small, contrasted with pre-war standards, some at least of the industries are showing signs of recovery. The prohibitions of Austrian imports by the Succession States have largely been modified or withdrawn, and the trade returns are improving. Can this process be continued or accelerated ? The policy of the Succession States has, at times, been short-sightedly selfish and parochial : but is it to be wondered at ? The Great Powers are regarded by these States with a respect amounting to veneration and the Great Powers have set the example. The Succession States cannot be blamed for not adopting broader and wider views than those of the Great Powers ; nor can they be expected, of their own initiative, to plan out and develop the revised policy which is necessary for the restoration of their own, as well as of the Austrian economy. Unless the Allied Powers are willing either to crown the error of St. Germain by deliberately ignoring the tragedy it has produced, or to avert that tragedy by regular financial support for many years to come, they must take the initiative and use all their influence to secure that, as far as possible, the mischief done by the dismemberment of Austro-Hungary is redeemed by a new spirit of co-operation and conciliation among all the States they have created.

The old Empire, after all, contributed greatly to the peace of Europe by holding together, under its ægis, the many rival nations represented in its territories ; and its collapse, without the creation of any substitute, threatens to bring about a very definite retrogression of civilisation in those territories. The new States have, of course, a greater capacity for supporting themselves than has Austria : but partly owing to natural conditions and partly to historic connections, they have close economic ties both

with her and with one another. The industries of Czecho-Slovakia, the agricultural wealth of Hungary and Serbia, the financial and intellectual experience of Austria are mutually complementary and they cannot, any of them, achieve or retain the prosperity of which they are capable, in isolation. Indeed, isolation is scarcely practical: and the alternative lies between co-operation and constant war. Even in the Balkans, war has lost something of its pristine popularity, and the Allied Powers have proclaimed their intention of ending it altogether. The best solution, therefore, for all parties is to build up again a common nexus—possibly by means of some form of Customs Union between these States. The Allied Governments at any rate must use their powerful influence to this end.

Undoubtedly it will not be easy to turn the stream. The Succession States are naturally proud of their new independence and will certainly look with the utmost suspicion, if indeed, they do not reject with contumely, any such scheme. It may be necessary to offer diplomatic or financial inducements to overcome their objections; but it may assuredly be affirmed that by some such means alone can the pacification and prosperity of Central Europe be restored within a reasonable period. Nor indeed is the outlook by any means hopeless; already a commencement has been made by the Conference of the Succession States at Portarosa, summoned as the result of American initiative (a fact which may be noted at a time when America proclaims her disinterestedness in European difficulties, and European statesmen confer every month). The Succession States too, with all their legitimate pride in their independence, are far from wishing to see the complete collapse of Austria. They still recognise, almost unconsciously and involuntarily, the place which Vienna has held in their minds and it may yet be found that they will do more for her than it might be thought feasible to expect.

Certainly this path must be tried for all it is worth. It is a vain delusion to imagine that the Austrian Republic can be established securely on the basis of a few commercial credits, even if such credits could be obtained. They might alleviate the situation for the time being, but they could not assist more than a fraction of the population. For the difficulties of the Austrian industries are merely the reflexion of the bankruptcy of the State. So long as the Government cannot balance its

budget without the printing press, industry and commerce cannot prosper, and a population cannot be fed indefinitely on paper. The private relief organizations, which have done such splendid work, cannot alone cope with the problem ; it is on too large a scale.

Unless energetic measures are taken by the Allies the derelict will be engulfed and the fate of Austria will be an ever-abiding reproach to the conscience of mankind. In past ages, great States and teeming cities have often enough been destroyed : the desert sands have covered them and their ruins alone bear witness to their former magnificence. Vienna, the premier city of Central Europe, is to-day threatened with the same fate : and, if nothing is done to remedy the situation, we may find ourselves forced to stand by and witness, enacted before our eyes, the destruction of a people which—despite the share which its rulers must bear of the guilt for the war—has done much for, and on the whole deserved well of, our civilisation. The problem can be summed up in a few words. The present population of Vienna cannot be supported by the territory to which it is attached : if it is not supported from abroad, it has only two alternatives, to emigrate or to perish. But the evacuation of a populous city is not easy to effect, especially in present conditions, and many would assuredly have to perish before it could be done. Europe cannot risk such a tragedy : for the position of Austria is, after all, only the most terrible and the most acute illustration of the economic dangers which as a result of other causes threaten also the other peoples of Europe. They too are suffering (only in less degree) from adverse exchanges : they also have difficulty in obtaining raw materials : and they alike find many of the markets on which they relied before the war now closed to them. The time may well come when they too will discover that they can no longer support themselves and that they have to appeal to new lands across the oceans for the means of existence. With what hope or justification could they make such an appeal, if the appeals of Austria had fallen on deaf ears ? To almost all the countries of Europe, the plea of Austria might well be addressed with the title *De Te Fabula.*

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EMPIRE

1. The British Commonwealth of Nations. By H. Duncan Hall. Methuen. 1920.
2. Democracy and the British Empire. By Professor Hearnshaw. Constable. 1920.
3. The Problem of the Commonwealth. By Lionel Curtis. Macmillans. 1915.
4. Greater Rome and Greater Britain. By Sir C. P. Lucas. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912.

THE English Constitution, like the kingdom of heaven, cometh not by observation. The greatest living statesman in Canada claims as its supreme merit, that it is 'the most flexible 'instrument of Government ever devised.'* Consequently, Englishmen, and in particular the insular section of the race, are apt to mistrust 'made' Constitutions as they mistrust 'made 'dishes,' and for the same reason: because they have a 'foreign 'flavour.'

Thus the labours of the Constituent Assembly in France excited nothing but contempt from an observer so generous and fair-minded as Arthur Young: 'Making the Constitution, which 'is a new term they have invented, as though a Constitution 'were a pudding to be made from a receipt.' Arthur Young unquestionably expresses with fidelity the mind of the majority of his countrymen. Yet it is pertinent to observe that of the people in the world to-day who derive their constitutional traditions from England, more than half are living under constitutions which are as much 'made' as the Organic Laws of France, or the German Constitution of 1919. The Federal Constitution of the United States may have in it more of the genius of Montesquieu than of Burke; it may have looked rather to the theory of Blackstone than to the practice of Walpole, but the British North America Act of 1867, the Commonwealth of Australia Act (1900), the Union of South Africa Act (1909), though embodying written instruments, are all instinct with the spirit of the Constitution which, *mutatis mutandis*, they

* Sir Robert Borden 'The War and the Future,' p. 138.

essayed to reproduce in the British Dominions beyond the seas. Yet the prejudice against the making of constitutions persists.

That rooted prejudice or wholesome instinct—whichever be the more appropriate description—has weighted the scales heavily against those who contend that the time has come, if it is not already past, for a more precise definition of the constitutional relations between the United Kingdom and the British Empire or Commonwealth overseas. Not that this loose but convenient phrase exhausts the analysis of the problem which confronts us. The complex character of the British Empire and the infinitely varied status of its component parts forbid such simplicity. The problem in fact includes not merely the relation between the United Kingdom and the great self-governing Dominions, but between Dominion and Dominion, and between the Dominions (including in that term the United Kingdom itself) collectively and severally on the one hand, and on the other the Colonies, Dependencies, Protectorates, Mandated Territories, and other units which go to make up the sum of the variegated organism known as the British Empire.

What form will that organism take in the future? Of the two classical types of related communities—communities connected by ties of kinship or of government—will it tend to approximate more nearly to the Greek or to the Roman type? Is the ideal form of connexion between mother and daughter lands that of an ἀποικία or a *Colonia?* Are the communities overseas to be like the Greek ἀποικίαι entirely independent of the State to which they owe their origin? Are they, while carrying to the uttermost parts of the earth the ideas and traditions, the culture and the creed, the language and laws of the motherland, to be connected with her only by the ties of kindred and affection? Or are they, like the Roman *Coloniae* to remain integral parts of the empire to which they originally belonged, to act as *propugnacula* for the Commonwealth, to accept the obligations and enjoy the privileges of common citizenship in a world-State?

The antithesis here suggested was admirably drawn out thirty years ago by a writer in this REVIEW :—

'There are two opposite currents of opinion prevailing at the present day on this great subject; and they will in all probability at some future time come sharply into conflict. Each regards the present condition of the British Empire as transitional; but whilst

the one believes that an ultimate solution will be found in the consolidation of the Queen's dominions under a single supreme Government, possessing authority and ability to govern and to direct the whole as a single nation, the other believes it is the destiny of Great Britain to be the 'Mother of Free Nations' in cordial alliance and friendly intercourse with which she will pursue her career without any diminution in her actual power or her true glory. Imperial federation is the ideal of the one school. Friendly alliance between Great Britain and those great English communities beyond the seas, now called dependencies but soon to be independent States, is the ideal of the other.'*

The problem here propounded has for the last thirty years rarely been absent from the minds of those who are either scientifically or politically interested in the future of the British Commonwealth and who are concerned that an organism, on the preservation of which the peace of the world and the happiness of mankind would seem so largely to depend, should not suffer for lack of forethought and foresight.

According to Seely's brilliant but misleading aphorism, foresight is indeed the last quality which could be associated in the past with the development of the British Empire. 'We 'conquered half the world,' so Seely declared, 'in a fit of absence 'of mind.' It would seem in some quarters to be assumed that it is only by maintaining a similar attitude of mental detachment that those conquests or 'plantations' can be preserved in the future. *Solvitur ambulando.* The problems of Empire will be solved—so the argument runs—only by trudging steadily and quietly along the high-road of day-by-day administration and not taking over-much thought for the morrow. Burke, if not the founder of this school, remains the most eminent exponent of its doctrines. 'To speak the plain truth, I have in general,' he declared, 'no very exalted opinion of the virtue of paper 'Government. . . . My hold of the Colonies is in the close 'affection which grows from common names, from kindred blood, 'from similar privileges, and equal protection. There are ties 'which, though light as air, are as strong as links of iron.'

Burke's theory as to the true relation between a mother-land and her colonies attracted, during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century, a large body of adherents. Among many causes which contributed to the ascendancy of this school the

* Edin. Review, July, 1891.

disruption of our first Colonial Empire was foremost in time and perhaps most potent in effect. Theory reinforced the teaching of experience. Englishmen learnt from the French physiocrats that ' colonies are like fruits which cling to the tree only till they ' ripen,' and the practical deduction from this simile was in complete accord with the prevailing political philosophy. The true function of the State was to abstain from interference ; the best Government was that which governed least ; happiest was the country which had no history. The doctrine of *laisser-faire*, if not unassailed, was strong enough for a lengthened period to resist all assaults, and alike in economics and in politics the Manchester School enjoyed an easy supremacy.

Sir George Cornewall Lewis's famous essay on ' The Govern- ' ment of Dependencies ' was published in the hey-day of the Manchester School (1841) and faithfully reflected its teaching. A few sentences will suffice to indicate the conclusion which he desired to enforce :—

> ' If a dominant country understood the true nature of the advantages arising from the supremacy and dependence of the related communities, it would voluntarily recognize the legal independence of each of its own dependencies as were fit for independence ; it would, by its political arrangements, study to prepare for independence those which were still unable to stand alone ; and it would seek to promote colonization for the purpose of extending its trade rather than its empire, and without intending to maintain the dependence of its colonies beyond the time when they need its protection.'

Lewis, though an active party politician, was in this matter the spokesman, not of a party, but of all who gave thought to Imperial affairs. Lord Blachford's* frequently quoted opinion was to the same effect. ' The function of the Colonial Office ' is to secure that our connection, while it lasts, shall be as ' profitable to both parties, and our separation, when it comes, as ' amicable as possible.'

Less well known than Cornewall Lewis's treatise or Lord Blachford's aphorism, but not less representative of the views then in the ascendant was Mr. Arthur Mills' ' Colonial ' Constitutions ' published in 1856. His argument may be summarized in a sentence : ' To ripen these communities (the

*As Sir Frederick Rogers, Lord Blachford was Permanent Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office.

'colonies) to the earliest possible maturity, social, political, 'commercial, to qualify them by all the appliances within the 'reach of the present State for present self-government and 'eventual independence is now the universally admitted aim of 'our colonial policy.'

In 1856, and for many years afterwards it was; but the two last decades of the nineteenth century witnessed a notable reaction against the doctrines of the Manchester School. In the sphere of industry *laisser-faire* had resulted in the sacrifice of the economically weak to the economically strong; numberless Commissions revealed to a conscience-stricken nation the scandals attaching to child-labour in mines and factories; the insanitary conditions in jerry-built towns; the intolerable oppression of sweated wage-earners, and much else. A humanitarian age revolted against the doctrine that 'the devil might take the 'hindmost,' and *laisser-faire* gave way to State control.

Nor was the reaction confined to the sphere of industry and economics. Cobdenism, whatever its merit or shortcomings, was at least a coherent system. Nationalism was to give place to internationalism; protection to free-trade; war to peace. In a world disarmed, denationalized, and united by the bonds of unrestricted free-trade, what room could there be for the Imperial spirit, for the retention of Colonies and Dependencies?

Cobden had, however, overshot the mark. There were elements in human nature and factors in politics of which he took no account. One thing he could hardly have foreseen: that the unification of the divided States of Germany would give a new impulse to militarism and high protection, and would initiate a scramble for tropical territories. Nor did he foresee the rapid shrinkage of the world under the operation of forces which, if not new, were newly harnessed to the service of man. As long ago as 1872 Tennyson, repudiating with scorn a suggestion that the Canadians should 'take up their freedom,' sounded a note which had not been heard in English poetry since the day of the Elizabethan singers. But it roused few echoes. Eleven years later Seely published his epoch-making volume and from that time onwards there was a crescendo of Imperialist sentiment which reached a climax in the 'Diamond' Jubilee—celebrated with every concomitant of imperialistic pageantry—in 1897.

Meanwhile the Imperial Federation League, founded by the

late W. E. Forster and others in 1883, had been doing much steady spade work in educating the public mind in the politics of Empire. The political leaders, both in the self-governing colonies, and still more in the home-land, trod very warily the path along which the League would fain have led them, but an important stage was registered when it was decided to bring into conference, in 1887, the responsible statesmen of the Empire. It was, indeed, high time they met. Indications were not wanting that the Dominions (if we may anticipate the use of a convenient and differentiating title) were beginning to feel acutely the anomalies of their constitutional position in the Empire. Virtually autonomous as regards their domestic concerns, the Dominions still occupied, in reference to external affairs, the position of outside petitioners to the Colonial Office.

The inconvenience, not to say the humiliation, of this position was vividly brought home to the Australasian Colonies in 1884 by German activity in the Pacific. Germany, but lately unified, developing industrially and commercially with astonishing rapidity, was anxious, not unnaturally, to secure a ' place in the ' sun.' Firmly established, with the entire goodwill of the British Government in Africa, she sought outposts in the southern seas. Regardless of the legitimate apprehensions of Australia and New Zealand, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Derby were bent upon smoothing the path of her ambition, and parts of New Guinea and the Samoan Islands were permitted to pass into her keeping. Mr. (afterwards Sir James) Service, at that time Premier of Victoria, gave vigorous expression to the feelings aroused by Lord Derby's attitude in the Colonies. He pointed to ' the very ' anomalous position which these colonies occupy as regards ' respectively local Government and the exercise of Imperial ' authority ' ; he argued that ' the weakness of this position has ' at times been most disadvantageously apparent and its ' humiliation keenly felt,' and he insisted that colonial interests were sufficiently important to entitle the colonies ' to some defined ' position in the Imperial economy, to some tangible means of ' asserting, if necessary, our rights.'

Echoes of this unfortunate controversy were naturally heard at the Conference of 1887. Mr. Deakin in particular caustically contrasted the eagerness with which French and German statesmen (as evidenced by the official despatches) received the

smallest details of information as to the movements of their traders in the Pacific and the zeal with which they hastened to support them, and 'the disdain and indifference with which 'English enterprise was treated in the Colonial Office.'

In proroguing Parliament in 1886 the Queen had expressed her conviction that there was 'on all sides a growing desire to 'draw closer in every practicable way the bonds which unite the 'various portions of the Empire,' but the question of constitutional relations was expressly excluded from the agenda of the ensuing conference. Nevertheless, Sir Samuel Griffiths did venture to refer to the Conference as containing 'what may perhaps be 'called the rudimentary elements of a Parliament.' The subject of federation was, however, officially taboo—perhaps wisely.

Far otherwise was it when, ten years later, another Colonial Conference* met under the presidency of Mr. Chamberlain. This Conference differed from the first in that the Dominions were represented only by their Prime Ministers, thus anticipating the form of the Imperial War Cabinet. It was differentiated even more markedly by the tone of Mr. Chamberlain's speeches. The Colonial Secretary frankly avowed his conviction that there was 'a real necessity for some better machinery of consultation 'between the self-governing Colonies and the Mother country,' and declared that nothing short of a Federal Council would fulfil his 'ultimate ideal.' But the growing cordiality of the Home Government evoked a somewhat cautious response from the Colonial Premiers who, with two dissentients, expressed their formal satisfaction with the 'present political relations.'

The next Conference (1902) proved to be somewhat less complacent. Cautiously but distinctly it affirmed the principle of the co-operation of the Dominions in the conclusion of treaties, by accepting a resolution that 'so far as may be consistent with 'the confidential negotiation of treaties with foreign powers, the 'views of the Colonies affected should be obtained in order that 'they may be in a better position to give adhesion to such 'treaties.' Mr. Chamberlain, who again presided, again avowed his own desire for 'a real council of the Empire to which all 'questions of Imperial interest might be referred,' and at the

* A second Conference had in the meantime (1894) met at Ottawa, and had been mainly occupied with the discussion of Imperial communications and commerce.

same time made to the Colonies an offer of high significance. 'If you,' he said, 'are prepared, at any time, to take any share, 'any proportionate share, in the burdens of the Empire, we are 'prepared to meet you with any proposal for giving to you a 'corresponding voice in the policy of the Empire.' The suggestion did not at the moment materialise, but it measured the distance which had been travelled, more particularly by the Home Government, since 1884.

Slowly but surely the 'Conference' was establishing itself as an integral part of the constitutional machinery of the Empire. The Conference of 1902 resolved that meetings should take place 'as far as practicable at intervals of not exceeding four years.' In 1907 the term 'Imperial' was substituted for 'Colonial'; the Dominion Ministers quietly asserted an equality of status with those of the Motherland by referring in a formal resolution to consultation between 'His Majesty's Government and His 'Governments of the self-governing Dominions beyond the 'seas'; and a permanent Conference Secretariat was set up at the Colonial Office. Apart from this, the Conference of 1907 was memorable for Mr. Deakin's grave indictment of the policy pursued by the Imperial Government in regard to Pacific questions. With complete disregard of colonial opinion, a Convention had been concluded with France in reference to the New Hebrides, and the unfortunate situation of 1884 had thus been almost precisely reproduced. Small wonder that Colonial statesmen found it difficult to restrain their indignation.

If the atmosphere was not over-genial in 1907, it was even less so in 1911, when Sir Joseph Ward brought forward, on behalf of New Zealand, a formal resolution in favour of federal union. Yet of the whole series of conferences, that of 1911 was the most important. The meeting coincided with the Agadir crisis; the peace of Europe hung at the moment by a thread, and Sir Edward (now Viscount) Grey wisely took the opportunity of admitting the Dominion Ministers into the complete confidence of the Home Government and laying before them, in secret session, a detailed survey of the diplomatic situation. The confidence was amply repaid; the Dominion Ministers returned to their several homes charged with a responsibility infinitely heavier than any which had rested on their predecessors, and when the crisis recurred in 1914 they were not taken unawares.

This was the stage in its constitutional evolution which the Conference had reached when the world-war broke out. The results thus far achieved were estimated in 1912, by a writer of singular wisdom, ripe knowledge, and almost unique experience.

'Nothing (wrote Sir C. P. Lucas) could be more in harmony with the British instinct and British methods of construction than the evolution of the Imperial Conference and its concomitants. Twenty-five years have elapsed since the first meeting of the kind took place without any system of any kind or any rule as to representation, and at the present moment the Imperial Conference is a well defined, fully understood, and fully recognised machinery, the meetings being held at stated intervals, and each meeting resulting in a step forward in the direction of Imperial unity. The wonder is that it has developed so rapidly. . . . any attempt to stimulate its growth by hothouse methods would be disastrous. . . . It is . . . not only inexpedient but absolutely impossible to build up the future except by slow degrees if the building is to endure.'*

The outbreak of the world-war brought to an abrupt but definite close one phase in the history of the Empire; not less certainly it opened another. With the superb and spontaneous contribution made by the Dominions and the Dependencies to the common cause this article is not concerned. Certain constitutional aspects of their co-operation must however be examined, and an attempt must be made to estimate, in a broad way, the effect of the varied incidents and experiments of the last six years upon the organism of the Commonwealth.

Upon one point emphasis must at the outset be laid. The actual participation of the Dominions was wholly voluntary; the amount of their contribution in men and money was entirely within their own discretion; but their legal implication in the war was involuntary, and indeed, inherent in their constitutional status. New Zealand could no more escape the consequences of Great Britain's declaration of war than could Scotland. At midnight on August 4th, 1914, Germany was as much entitled to bombard Halifax, Vancouver, Capetown or Sydney, as to bombard Portsmouth or Chatham. War was declared for the Empire, and only in one way could any single unit of the Empire escape responsibility for the decision of the Imperial Government:

* 'Greater Rome and Greater Britain.' pp. 173–4. The history of the Conference may be best read in the Blue Books or in Jebb: 'The Imperial Conference,' 1911.

by formal secession. To remain in the Empire and to maintain neutrality was a legal impossibility.

That Germany would have hesitated to push any of the Dominions or Dependencies into this dilemma is likely enough ; virtual neutrality would have served her purpose, and that she counted upon this, if no more, is unquestionable. Of the many grave miscalculations of the military party at Potsdam, this was perhaps the gravest. They unquestioningly accepted Bernhardi's confident assurance that the first shot fired against England in a European war would be the signal for the dissolution of England's 'loosely compacted Empire.' Some of their publicists, with a clearer apprehension of the truth, candidly admitted their cruel disillusionment : Dr. Friedrich Naumann, for example, wrote :—

> 'The unsystematic character of English Imperialism has often been pointed to as a deficiency by theoretical critics among the Germans, and people believed that the loosely constructed building would break in pieces by reason of the superficiality of the link between its many members. But the war has shown, in this case too, that loose threads, when they are properly put together, can hold fast. The Empire, geographically so varied, spread out on every coast, has remained a unity.' (*Mittel-Europa*, Eng. trans. p. 184.)

But although Germany's anticipations were destined to disappointment, the war did reveal grave defects in the constitutional machinery of the British Empire. The spirit by which the body-politic was infused could not have been better ; the practical results could hardly have been improved ; the mechanism could hardly have been worse.

The question inevitably suggests itself : might not the spirit have been worse had the machinery been better ? Given the peculiar genius of Englishmen, might not overmuch thought for the morrow have defeated its own object. Was not spontaneity of the essence of success ? Such questions cannot be lightly brushed aside. The affirmative reply commands many adherents.

On the other hand it is impossible to ignore the impressive warnings as to the inadequacy of existing arrangements uttered by the leading statesmen of the Dominions. Speaking early in the war at Winnipeg, Sir Robert Borden said : 'It is impossible 'to believe that the existing status, so far as it concerns the 'control of foreign policy and extra-Imperial relations, can remain

'as it is to-day.' 'These pregnant events,' he said in December, 1915, 'have already given birth to a new order. It is realised 'that great policies and questions which concern and govern the 'issues of peace and war cannot in future be assumed by the 'people of the British islands alone.' In language not less emphatic and more picturesque, Mr. Doherty, the Minister of Justice, spoke to similar purpose at Toronto :—

'Our recognition of this war as ours, our participation in it, spontaneous and voluntary as it is, determines absolutely once for all that we have passed from the status of the protected colony to that of the participating nation. The protected colony was rightly voiceless ; the participating nation cannot continue so. The hand that wields the sword of the Empire justly holds the sceptre of the Empire ; while the Mother Country alone wielded the one, to her alone belonged the other. When, as to-day, the nations of the Empire join in wielding that sword, then must they jointly sway that sceptre.'

Australia and New Zealand re-echoed the voice of Canada. 'There must be a change and it must be radical in its nature,' declared Mr. Hughes. Mr. Fisher and Sir Joseph Ward spoke with similar emphasis, and the same point was driven home in England by Mr. Bonar Law :—

'It is not a possible arrangement that one set of men should contribute the lives and treasure of their people and should have no voice in the way in which those lives and that treasure are expended. That cannot continue. There must be a change.'*

Bluntly put, the warning uttered by the Dominions to the Home-land amounted to this : 'You have involved us in war 'without consulting us ; we have come into it and waged it with 'all our might ; we know that the cause in which we fight is 'righteous ; we are prepared to send our last man and to spend 'our last shilling ; you can count upon us to the end, but—be 'it understood "never again" ; complete self-government 'involves something more than the control of our own domestic 'affairs, it means at least a voice in the conduct of the foreign 'policy of the whole Empire.' The plea was irresistible and the warning was not unheeded. The pity was that it had not been heeded twenty years earlier, and that response was delayed until all the grace of it had evaporated. But it came at last.

---

* *Times*, September 13th, 1916, quoted by Duncan Hall, *op. cit.* p. 162.

The first act of the Government which came into power in England in December, 1916, was to invite the Prime Ministers of the Dominions and representatives of India to visit England in 1917, and to become members, for the time being, of the War Cabinet—by that time reduced to five members. The invitation was accepted, and on March 20, 1917, the Imperial War Cabinet met for the first time. It consisted of the five members of the War Directory; the Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs, the Colonies and India; (the last being 'advised' by three representatives of India); three representatives of Canada; two of New Zealand; one of South Africa (General Smuts) and one of Newfoundland. This new Imperial Cabinet was summoned specifically to consider 'urgent conditions affecting the 'prosecution of the war, the possible conditions (of peace) and 'the problems which will then immediately arise.' Its constitutional status and political functions were defined with precision by Earl Curzon. Speaking as leader of the House of Lords, he said :—

'The representatives are not coming here to endeavour to construct a brand-new constitution for the British Empire. The capacity in which they come, however, does constitute a remarkable forward step in the constitutional evolution of the Empire. They are not coming as members of an Imperial Conference of the old style. They are coming as members for the time being of the governing body of the British Empire. This seems to me the greatest step ever taken in recognising the relations of the Dominions and ourselves on a basis of equality. . . . The War Cabinet is for a purpose being expanded into an Imperial Council.'*

Lord Curzon's language is at once cautious, precise and hopeful, nor can the significance of the experiment thus outlined be denied. But the question remains: how far did the Imperial War Cabinet fulfil the anticipations of those who had the wit to summon it?

The reports of the War Cabinet for 1917 and 1918—the publication of which marks in itself a notable innovation in constitutional practice—reveal more of the *arcana* of the constitution than has ever been revealed before; yet, even so, we can estimate results only from the formal utterances of the statesmen actually engaged in the experiment. The most

*House of Lords. *Official Report*, February 7th, 1917.

important of these statements was made by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons (May 17, 1917) :—

'It is (said Mr. Lloyd George) desirable that Parliament should be officially and formally acquainted with an event that will constitute a memorable landmark in the constitutional history of the British Empire. . . . The British Cabinet became for the time being an Imperial War Cabinet. While it was in session its overseas members had access to all the information which was at the disposal of His Majesty's Government and occupied a status of absolute equality with that of the members of the British War Cabinet. . . . So far as we are concerned we can say with confidence that the experiment has been a complete success. . . . The Imperial War Cabinet were unanimous that the new procedure had been of such service, not only to all its members but to the Empire, that it ought not to be allowed to fall into desuetude.'

Accordingly, it was resolved that an Imperial War Cabinet consisting of 'the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and 'such of his colleagues as deal specially with Imperial affairs, 'of the Prime Ministers of the Dominions or some specially 'accredited alternate possessed of equal authority' and of a representative of India should meet annually, or more often if occasion demanded. Mr. Lloyd George concluded with expressing the hope, common to his colleagues and himself that 'the 'holding of an annual Imperial Cabinet to discuss foreign 'affairs and other aspects of Imperial policy will become an 'accepted convention of the British Constitution.'

The utterances of Dominion representatives corroborated the impression conveyed by the Premier's announcement. Sir Robert Borden, for instance, in an address to the Empire Parliamentary Association (April 3, 1917) was, if anything, even more explicit :—

'We meet there (in the Imperial Cabinet) on terms of equality under the presidency of the First Minister of the United Kingdom; we meet there as equals; he is *primus inter pares*. Ministers from six nations sit around the Council board, all of them responsible to their respective Parliaments and to the people of the countries which they represent. Each nation has its voice upon questions of common concern and highest importance as the deliberations proceed; each preserves unimpaired its perfect autonomy, its self government, and the responsibility of its ministers to their own electorate. For many years the thought of statesmen and students in every part of the Empire has centred around the question of future constitutional

relations ; it may be that now as in the past the necessity imposed by great events has given the answer.'*

The passage here quoted was rightly deemed sufficiently significant to be reproduced in the official Report of the War Cabinet for 1917† ; but it by no means stood alone. The character of the experiment, the form of procedure, above all the complete success of the new departure in constitutional practice, rest upon irrefutable testimony. As Sir Robert Borden himself well put it : ' With that new Cabinet a new era has dawned and ' a new page of history has been written.'

The experiment was repeated in the summer of 1918. The second session of the Imperial War Cabinet opened on June 11th and continued until July 30th. The second session differed in composition and in other ways from the first. It was attended by the Prime Minister and the other members of the War Cabinet ; by the Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs, for the Colonies, for India, for War and for the Royal Air Force, as well as by the First Lord of the Admiralty. Australia, unrepresented in 1917 owing to a general election, was represented by the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth (Mr. Hughes) and by the Minister of the Navy ; Newfoundland by its Premier ; Canada and New Zealand, by their respective Premiers, and one other Minister ; South Africa by General Smuts and Mr. Burton ; India by the Secretary of State, by the Maharaja of Patiala as ' the spokesman ' of the Princes of India,' and by Sir S. P. Sinha, now Lord Sinha, who was ' deputed to this country as the representative of the people ' of India.' The scope and competence of the Empire Cabinet was also, it would seem, enlarged, since it was officially intimated that its deliberations ' were not confined to the all absorbing ' military problems ' (how absorbing those problems were is sufficiently indicated by the dates—June 11th to July 30th) but covered the whole field of Imperial policy, including many aspects of foreign policy and the war aims for which the British Commonwealth was fighting. It is, adds the Report, ' worth ' noting in this connection that the oversea members of the ' Imperial War Cabinet not only helped to settle the policy to ' be adopted by the British Government at the session of the ' Allied Supreme Council in July, but also attended one of the

* Sir Robert Borden : ' The War and the Future,' p. 144. † p. 9.

' meetings of the Supreme War Council in person.'*

Not only was the competence of the Cabinet extended but its machinery was improved. Before it adjourned resolutions were adopted that henceforward the Prime Ministers of the Dominions should have the right, as members of the Imperial Cabinet, of direct communication with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and *vice versa* ; and that in order to secure continuity in the work of this Cabinet each Dominion Premier should have the right to nominate a Cabinet Minister either as a resident or visitor in London to represent him at meetings of the Cabinet to be held regularly between the plenary sessions.

These resolutions plainly indicate that in the second session a further stage had been reached in the evolution of a particularly interesting institution. Its permanence was assumed and its continuity appeared to be secured.

Before the latter resolutions could take effect the military collapse of the Central Powers—unexpectedly rapid and complete —precipitated the summoning of the Peace Conference. The Dominion representatives were promptly recalled to England and by the 20th of November the Imperial Cabinet, though not complete in personnel until the close of the year, was again in session.

The centre of political gravity then shifted from London to Paris, and in Paris the Imperial War Cabinet reappeared as the British Empire Delegation. As such it played an immensely important part in the protracted deliberations of the Peace Conference. Had the Dominions been represented at Paris only in and by the British Empire Delegation it might have made for simplicity of procedure ; for the avoidance of friction at the moment, and of complications both internal and external in the future. Had that course been adopted the Peace Conference would still have formed, as General Smuts claims that it did form, ' one of the most important landmarks in the history ' of the Empire ' ; but with such a position the Dominions were not disposed to be content.

' It was abundantly clear to my colleagues and myself that Australia must have separate representation at the Peace Conference ; consider the vastness of the Empire and the density of interests represented. Look at it geographically, industrially, or how you will, and it will be

**Report of War Cabinet for* 1918, pp. 9, 10.

seen that no one can speak for Australia but those who speak as representatives of Australia herself.'*

So spake Mr. Hughes in the Commonwealth House of Representatives. Other Dominion Premiers have spoken—since they were free to speak—to the same effect; but perhaps the Dominions' claim and the ground of it is best and most tersely expressed in a telegram from the Canadian Cabinet to Sir Robert Borden, who was at the time sitting in the Imperial War Cabinet:—

'. . . In view of war efforts of Dominion other nations entitled to representation at Conference should recognise unique character of British Commonwealth composed of group of free nations under one Sovereign and that provision should be made for special representation of these nations at Conference, even though it may be necessary that in any final decision reached they should speak with one voice.' (December 4th, 1918).†

Sir Robert Borden accordingly claimed separate representation for each of the Dominions equal to that of Belgium and other small allied nations. To Canada the idea was intolerable that the United States should have five delegates and Canada none; for, as General Smuts put it when speaking in the Union Parliament: 'Canada and Australia made a greater war effort 'than any other Powers below the rank of first class. Australia 'alone lost more men than the United States of America.' To the reasonableness of the claims of the Dominions the British Government were easily persuaded; not so the Allied representatives.

'They could not (as General Smuts subsequently pointed out) realise the new situation arising and that the British Empire instead of being one central Government consisted of a league of free States, free, equal, and working together for the great ideals of human government.'‡

Stated thus bluntly the situation might perhaps have created surprise if not alarm in the minds of other people besides the allied representatives. But the Dominions had their way. In

---

*Commonwealth of Australia *Parliamentary Debates*, No. 87, p. 12168. The whole of Mr. Hughes's speech on the Peace Treaty will repay the most careful perusal.

† Quoted by Duncan Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

‡ *Ibid*, pp. 185 and 183–4.

the *Plenary Conference* Australia, Canada and South Africa were each represented by two delegates, being treated as small nations on the same level as Belgium; New Zealand was represented by one. The Dominions in the aggregate were also entitled to be included in the British Empire Delegation of five members. Nor was the part which they played on this Delegation insignificant or subordinate. On the contrary the leader of the British House of Commons emphatically insisted that just as in the Imperial War Cabinet the Dominion representatives 'took in 'every respect an equal part in all that concerned the conduct 'of the war; so in Paris in the last few months they have, as 'members of the British Empire Delegation taken a part as great 'as that of any member, except perhaps the Prime Minister, 'in moulding the Treaty of Peace.'*

Well might General Smuts acclaim the Paris Conference as one of the most important landmarks in the history of the Empire. It is indeed impossible to read the debates on the Peace Treaty in the Legislatures of Canada and Australia† respectively without becoming acutely conscious of the fact that profoundly as were the Dominions interested in the actual terms of the Treaty of Versailles they were even more interested in the new status accorded to their representatives alike in the negotiations precedent to the signature of the Treaty and in the League of Nations. That status—cordially conceded by the Imperial Government but somewhat reluctantly recognised by the Allied and Associated Powers—was succinctly and accurately defined by a speaker in the Commonwealth Parliament. 'The Empire,' said Mr. Burchell, 'to-day stands in the position of a league of nations 'within the League of Nations.'‡

Towards the assertion on the one side, and on the other the recognition, of the complete nationhood of the self-governing Dominions things have for some time been tending; but as so often happens in political evolution the final stage was reached with dramatic suddenness. The outbreak of war found the

---

* Speech by Mr. Bonar Law to the Empire Parliamentary Association, May 16th, 1919; quoted *ibid.*, p. 189.

† The Debates in the Parliament of the Union of South Africa do not appear to have been published.

‡ *Commonwealth of Australia Debates*, No. 90, p. 12586.

Imperial Government in a position, as regards international affairs, of unquestioned autocracy; the signature of Peace left the Dominions almost on a plane of equality with the Mother-country, *vis à vis* the other nations of the world. Full equality is claimed on their behalf. Thus Mr. Rowell, President of the Council of Canada, speaking in the Dominion Parliament (March 11th, 1920) said :—

> 'I venture to think that the position won for Canada by her soldiers on the field of battle and maintained for her by her statesmen at the Peace Conference, recognised and made certain by the bringing into force and by the coming into operation of the Treaty of Peace and the formal inauguration of the League, means that Canada is not only an integral portion and one of the free nations of the British Empire, but has an acknowledged status among the other nations of the world. . . . The status is one of equality; we are nations within the Empire, all equal in status, though not of equal power, under a common Sovereign, and bound together by ties of interest and sentiment, by history and by all that united the different branches of the Anglo-Saxon peoples, and the other nations within the various portions of the Empire, by ties which though light as air are strong as iron in binding together this great League of Nations which we call the British Empire, or the Britannic Commonwealth.'

Quotations of similar import might be almost indefinitely multiplied from the speeches and writings of Dominion statesmen, and the significance of the language is unmistakable. The Dominions are at all costs determined on recognition of their equal nationhood within the Empire. The war which was to forge the last link in the chain of federalism has resulted in the making of a Britannic Confederation; it has issued, in Professor Hearnshaw's technical and precise phrase, 'in a '*Staaten-bund* and not a *Bundesstaat*; a league of nations within 'the larger league, not a composite unitary State.'* Sir Charles Lucas foresaw the development before the war, and expressed it in a sentence: 'We have created nations and cannot uncreate 'them. We can only recognise and welcome existing conditions 'and move forward again. . . . There is only one sure 'guide to the future and that is the race instinct which represents 'day to day opportunism.'† It is truly said.

Perspective and proportion must however be maintained. In according recognition to the insistent idea of nationhood we

---

Op. cit., p. 166. † *Op. cit.*, pp. 170, 172.

must not ignore the equally insistent ideas of Imperial unity and loyalty to a common Sovereign. No one has preached the gospel of nationhood with greater fervour than General Smuts; no one has been at more pains to emphasize the supreme value of the golden link supplied by the Crown. 'The theory of the 'Constitution is that the King is not your king, but the king of 'all of us, ruling over every part of the whole Commonwealth 'of nations.'* And similarly Sir Robert Borden: 'The Crown 'acts in all the self-governing Dominions of the Empire. . . . 'It is the same Crown throughout, acting upon the advice of 'different Ministers. That tie of allegiance to the Crown is 'the tie which chiefly binds together the Empire to-day so far as 'Constitutional considerations are concerned.'†

The value of the hereditary kingship is indeed incalculable; and in the prevailing mood of the peoples of the Empire it may be the part of wisdom to place exclusive reliance upon that great asset and to attempt nothing further or more precise in the way of constitutional definition. Yet the problem remains; and it has rarely been more clearly stated than in a singularly able book from the pen of a young Australian student, who has lately been in residence at the University of Oxford.‡

Mr. Duncan Hall re-echoes the latest if not the last word in Colonial nationalism. His work is not free from blemishes, and even from serious inaccuracies; the manner is infused by the dogmatism characteristic of youth, the matter betrays inexperience of affairs, nevertheless the book is marked by a freshness of outlook, a vigour of expression and an originality of treatment which render it a most acceptable addition to the literature of Imperial Politics. Moreover, its publication is particularly opportune at a moment when the leading statesmen of the Empire are again about to meet in Cabinet consultation in London.

The meeting of the first Imperial Peace Cabinet may well prove to be a not less memorable land-mark in the history of the British Commonwealth than the first meeting, in 1917, of the Imperial War Cabinet. Unlike the sessions of 1917 and 1918 the Cabinet meetings of 1921 will, it is announced, be completely divorced from the machinery of the Imperial *Conference*. In

* *War Time Speeches*, p. 34. † *Op. cit.*, p. 143.
‡ 'The British Commonwealth of Nations.'

theory Cabinet and Conference were distinct in 1917 and 1918, but partial identity of personnel induced some confusion in the public mind, and also perhaps contributed to some lack of definiteness in the differentiation of functions. No such confusion should arise in 1921. The Imperial Conference will not, it is understood, be in session ; the representatives of the Dominions and India will come together as members of the Supreme Executive.

The position is admittedly anomalous. The English mind finds it difficult to conceive of a single Executive without a single corresponding Legislature. Yet the statesmen who sit round the Cabinet table next June will be collectively responsible to no single Legislature ; they will be severally responsible to half a dozen. But the British Constitution has survived more serious anomalies and has surmounted much more formidable obstacles than this. As it has been, so may it be. A robust faith in the political genius of the British peoples must not, however, blind us either to the existence of a problem, or to the difficulties surrounding its solution. No attentive reader of the overseas Press or recent debates in Dominion Parliaments can fail to be conscious of a pervasive suspicion of any centralized institution—an uneasy apprehension lest at the very moment when the triumph of Colonial nationalism is most conspicuous, the independence of the component States should be bartered away for a mess of Imperial pottage.

The explanation of a situation not without an element of paradox, is probably in large measure psychological and physical. The years of excessive strain have produced exhaustion ; people are tired ; nerves are overstrung ; under such circumstances it is essential to walk warily ; to avoid giving not merely cause of offence, but even the suspicion of cause of offence. The machinery of the Empire must needs ere long be overhauled ; yet prudence whispers : *festina lente*.

J. A. R. Marriott.

THE NAVAL SITUATION

1. The Grand Fleet, 1914—16; its Creation, Development and Work. By Admiral Viscount Jellicoe of Scapa, G.C.B., O.M. 1919.
2. Naval Policy: A Plea for the Study of War. By "Barfleur" (Admiral Sir Reginald Custance, G.C.B.) 1907.
3. Fortification, its past Achievements, recent Development, and Future Progress. By Sir George Sydenham Clarke (Lord Sydenham) G.C.M.G. 1907.
4. The Ship of the Line in Battle. By Admiral Sir Reginald Custance, G.C.B. 1912.

THE naval crisis with which we are confronted is of a twofold character. Decisions will be called for as to two supremely important matters; whilst there are others which, though of less importance than these two, are still serious enough in themselves to add greatly to the difficulties and perplexities of the authorities on whom the duty of settling them will rest. There has never been a case in time of peace in which it is—as at present—so urgently desirable that the nation should be governed by a steady determination to show patience and self-restraint, and should believe that the best is being done to solve the grave naval questions that have arisen.

In order to understand the situation it will be necessary to look back over a long period. For more than two centuries the British navy has been, and has been universally regarded as, the strongest in the world. If it ever had to anticipate that it might have to meet a numerically superior force it could see that such force would not be that of a single Power but of a combination of Powers. Until the close of the last century or the earlier years of this century the primacy—we ought not to say the predominance, which may have an arrogant tinge, but the primacy—of the British navy, was accepted by the world at large without protest. One reason of this was that first Great Britain, and then the British Empire as it grew up, had comparatively speaking only a very small army. That army was, as it had often proved, a highly gallant and most efficient body; but, if placed by the side of the armies of the leading European states, its numerical inferiority would have been conspicuous. No rival, no probable enemy could ignore the fact that Great

Britain was an island. It was reasonable to conclude, and it was generally concluded, that what the armies of the great Continental Powers, with their land frontiers, were to them the navy was to us with our frontier entirely maritime. This by itself led to practically universal acquiescence in our naval primacy. We shall see directly what that primacy meant to the world.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries what is now known as the British Empire grew up. It was scattered about every ocean. Communication between one part of it and another was necessarily maritime. The prosperity—indeed the economic existence, and in some cases even the political existence of parts of the over-seas British territory—depended, as is still the case, upon the security of their maritime communications. This also was perceived by foreign nations; and—it is only fair to say—was accepted by them. The growth of the Empire continued and was accompanied by a remarkable feature. Great communities of English-speaking people were settling in hitherto unoccupied wildernesses which they turned into productive areas, adding enormously to the means of sustenance and to the wealth of the world. In their prosperity every nation shared. If by some awful and unprecedented catastrophe the sea-communication of—not to mention other British territories—Canada, Australia and New Zealand were to be permanently, or even for a long time, interrupted there are but few countries that would not suffer acutely. The security of those sea-communications was due to the position held by the British navy. If there is anybody who doubts this, he may be invited to recall to his mind the history of the years 1914-1918. It should be remembered that the British Isles were becoming more and more dependent on sea-borne importation for the raw materials of the industries by which their inhabitants could gain a livelihood and—what was still more important—for a large and increasing proportion of their food. Bearing in mind what happened in 1916 and 1917 we can understand what the primacy of the British navy meant as to the safety of the Mother-country. No other considerable country in the world is similarly situated. All states of the first, the second, and indeed the third rank—in whichever hemisphere they lie—have land frontiers and are not exclusively dependent on open sea-routes for sustenance. The position of Cuba—even if she be entitled to rank as a state of the third class—is peculiar.

and does not invalidate what has just been said. Whilst the possession of a considerable navy may have been an advantage to other countries, it was much more than advantage, it was an absolute and unavoidable necessity to the British Isles and the whole British Empire. Nature and the economic development of the world had made it so.

All this may, perhaps, be characterised as 'self regarding.' There was another aspect of the long accepted primacy of the British navy which must not be left out of sight. It deserved and obtained the gratitude of many different countries and peoples. To take the nineteenth century alone we can see how its influence was utilised. In the first decade of that century Napoleon tried to make of Spain a virtual province of his empire. He made his brother, Joseph, king of Spain. The patriotism and splendid spirit of the Spanish people would—it cannot be doubted—have eventually restored the country's independence. The patriotic task was greatly lightened and the time for its completion greatly reduced by the aid which the British navy—secure in its primacy—was able to afford. It permitted the British people to send supporting armies and supplies to the Spanish patriots. Is it possible to believe that this could have been done if there had been another navy stronger than the British ?

What counterpoise was there or could there have been to the great confederate autocrats of the Holy Alliance except the then paramount British navy ? Its work was silent but effective, and did more to prevent freedom from being crushed than was possible to any other force or influence. When the countries of Latin America asserted their long-wished-for independence it was the primacy of the British navy that prevented their desires from being frustrated by the confederated autocrats of Europe, the possessors of the greatest armies in the world. These armies were useless for the suppression of freedom because our naval primacy in itself forbade their despatch to the Western Hemisphere. It was the age of the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine. It is American authority which can be cited for the conviction that what made the celebrated Doctrine an effective influence was its being able to rest ultimately on the support of the British navy. The value of the support was exactly proportionate to the relative international position of that navy.

Had any other navy been stronger the Monroe Doctrine would not have been accepted without protest, or more likely, something stronger than mere protest. It ensured the liberation of Latin America. This was thoroughly understood and was long remembered in the countries included in the term. The people of South America long remembered the help that the naval power of Great Britain—silently exercised as it had been—had afforded them in gaining their independence. Their gratitude went beyond words. Peru allowed us to keep a stationary ship for many years in the roadstead of Callao. Chili did the same for us at Valparaiso. Brazil went farther ; she not only allowed us to have for a long period in the noble harbour of Rio de Janeiro a stationary ship, she also made over to us an island, Cobras, close to the most important quarter of the capital city, for use as a naval repairing yard and store depôt.

The silent but effective influence of British naval primacy was felt practically all over the world, and was as beneficent as effective. The Dutch were able to regain—and what is more important to retain—their immensely valuable colonies in the East Indian Archipelago. We need have no illusions as to the fate of these rich dependencies if the German navy had been able to win what it was trying for, viz., the control of the sea. Germans themselves have given us hints by no means obscure of the fate awaiting the Dutch colonies—and indeed of the Kingdom of the Netherlands itself—had success attended the criminal and barbarously conducted assault made by them under the influence of their militarists and professors on civilisation and the freedom of the world. Until she lost it as a result of her own shocking crimes, Germany had built up a great empire overseas. This was done, not so much under the disinterested sufferance of the British naval primacy as by its virtual support. Acquisition of territory in distant continents and archipelagoes was all but—or quite—completed by Germany before she had reached anything like the naval position which was hers when she began the World War. There was more than one country that could have forbidden and prevented German colonial expansion had the British navy not been available to preserve the peace of the world. The vast increase of German maritime trade, especially in the Far East, occurred under the shelter of the British navy which principally policed distant seas.

The great North African Empire of France, founded in 1830, could not have been either begun or extended as it has been, if the use of British naval power had been anything but friendly or had been insufficient to prevent, if occasion should arise, interference with French enterprise. There were not wanting those who would have interfered had the attitude of the British people been different. Exactly the same thing may be said about the over-seas expansion of Italy. Silent but effective British naval support of the Italian people is an old story. Garibaldi could have told the world something about it. As late as 1889 Italian apprehensions of an attack upon them were set at rest by the knowledge that they might rely upon the support afforded by a navy that no other fleet was able to defy. As regards smaller nations, it may be reasonably asked if non-naval Belgium could have possibly acquired a great and valuable territory in Africa had the British navy been unfriendly or indifferent. We know who it was that grudged Belgium her new possession and who would, had comparative naval strength permitted, have prevented her acquiring it.

Enough has been said to show that the long maintained primacy of the British navy was never opposed to legitimate expansion of either trade or territory by any nation great or small. That primacy, though it may not have been absolutely spotless —what human institution is ?—was on the whole beneficent and a powerful factor in the operation of preserving peace. Surely it is significant that that peace was broken by the very nation which challenged and tried to destroy the naval position so long held by the British Empire. There was little or no concealment of their aims when the Germans embarked on the course which was to end in the ' Trident ' being transferred to their hands. All civilised nations now are agreed that the frustration of those aims was for the good of the whole world. So, at the end of the great war the British Empire still retained its primacy on the sea. The first of the two supremely important matters, alluded to already, that call for decision is whether that primacy is to be retained or not. The United States have now a shipbuilding programme which, if carried out, would put the British Empire in the second position as a naval Power—unless we too engage in a programme equally comprehensive. If we are to do so we shall be compelled to incur pecuniary expenditure that can only

be characterised as gigantic ; and this too at a time when our ability to meet it is more than doubtful. Reduction of expenditure, not increase of it, is the pressing need of the hour. The costly ' building slip ' competition with Germany in the eight or ten years before the war produced ' capital ships ' with which everyone is now disappointed. Is there another competition of the same kind in front of us ?

The motives of the United States in greatly increasing the American navy need not be likened to those of the Germans in the earlier years of the present century. The great Republic is not dominated by a ' sword-rattling ' clique of militarists aided and abetted by arrogant and aggressive professors. The United States, taking into account present conditions and resources awaiting and certain of future development, are the greatest Power in the world. It is natural that the American people should desire to have a navy adequate to their true needs. In view of a possible competition in naval armaments it is necessary to point out that the British navy is no longer the navy of Great Britain ; it is the navy of the British Empire. The term ' Navy ' of Great Britain ' should be abolished, and ' Navy of the ' British Empire ' be invariably substituted for it. Does the world in general, do we ourselves realise that there are already nearly, and that there soon will be, in the British overseas territories twenty millions of inhabitants of European stock ? The magnitude of these territories is usually lost sight of. To take elements of comparison from the Northern Hemisphere alone, the coast line of the Australian Commonwealth is greater than the coast line of the United States including Alaska. The British Empire, over and above the territories just referred to, comprises others which give it a population larger than that of any State in the world, unless it be China, which is doubtful. All this will have to be taken into consideration by the authorities who must decide as to our future naval policy. Surely a harder task has rarely been laid upon anyone. If ever public authorities deserved and ought to receive national sympathy and confidence, they pre-eminently deserve both at the present time.

The second of the two supremely important matters which will call for settlement in the present crisis is the direction that our ship-building policy ought to take in the immediate future. This, at the very outset will be beset with all the difficulties due

to the financial circumstances of the country. As things are, can we afford the expenditure that a ' bold ' naval ship-building programme would render inevitable ? Though it is right to mention this, it will not be necessary to dwell upon it at length. Cutting a coat according to the cloth is not an easy job when the cloth itself is scanty. With regard to our future ship-building action it is permissible to surmise that—whatever direction it may take—it will be duly regardful of the financial conditions of the time. There will—so to speak—be no ' going in for ' expenditure bald-headed.' We may find valuable instruction in the story of the ' Dreadnought policy ' of a still recent day—the policy that was in favour when we were engaged in a ship-building competition with Germany and avowed our determination to ' go one better ' than our rival.

The battle-ship Dreadnought dated from 1906. It was widely proclaimed that she had rendered all foreign ships of her class, then existing, obsolete. It was not admitted that, if such were the case, she must also have rendered obsolete many ships of our own though of recent construction. The Dreadnought had a displacement of 17,900 tons, being bigger than any battle-ship in the world. The Germans took the hint conveyed in our admitted, indeed vaunted, intention of putting their ships on the obsolete list by building a bigger one of our own. With less than the ordinary German slowness they replied to our Dreadnought of 1906 with the ' Nassau ' class of 18,600 tons in 1907. We were bound by the terms of our ' go one better ' policy and found ourselves obliged to reply to the Nassau with the Collingwood of 19,250 tons. Then the Germans took up the running and built the Heligoland of 22,400 tons. The pace was being forced, but we were not going to give up the race ; so we turned out the Orion of 22,500 tons. The next move was with the Germans, who built the ' Kaiser ' class of 24,410 tons. At first our reply must have seemed feeble to those who regarded superior bigness as a guarantee of invincibility ; for we answered with the King George, Ajax, etc., of only 23,000 tons. We soon pulled ourselves together and built the Iron Duke, Marlborough, etc., of 25,000 tons. The Germans topped this figure with their ' König ' class of 25,390 tons. We had to show them that in war fought on the building-slips we were not going to be beaten ; so we produced the Queen Elizabeth with the imposing

displacement of 27,500 tons. Then the real war broke out. Of course during the competition the cost of individual ships was mounting. The Dreadnought had cost nearly a million and a half. By the time that we had reached the Iron Duke the cost per ship was over two millions. In the case of the Queen Elizabeth it was higher still. It should be remembered that each ship named was usually only one amongst several.

There was exactly the same rise in dimensions and, of course, in cost when we engaged in a competition of 'battle cruiser' building. Our Inflexible (1905-6) was of 17,250 tons; the German Von der Tann (1907-8) was of 19,100 tons. The Germans advanced by successive steps—22,640; 24,610; and 26,180 tons. Our advance was less gradual. We built the Lion (three ships) of 26,350 tons, thus out-doing the biggest German figure; and then we jumped to the Tiger, 28,500. The increase in calibre of heavy guns was slower. Until 1909-10 the heaviest gun mounted in our battle-ships was the 12-inch. In the period following we went on to the 13.5-inch; after that our battle-ships carried 15-inch guns. The German corresponding ships carried either 11-inch or 12-inch guns, and the latter was their largest calibre at Jutland.

This summarised history of our 'building-slip' contest ought to be interesting to any who care to contemplate the future. In the war our biggest battle-ship had a displacement of 27,500 tons; our biggest battle-cruiser 28,500. The flag-ship of the commander-in-chief at Jutland is stated to have cost somewhat more than two millions. Our most recent ship, the Hood, has a displacement of 41,200 tons. It has been said that her cost was about seven millions. The probable cost of each future ship of the class—if any are to be built—is put at nine millions. If, therefore, we engage in another 'building-slip' competition it looks as though we must take 41,200 tons and £9,000,000 as constituting the *datum* line or 'scratch' from which we shall have to start. These figures refer to capital ships only; a navy must include many other classes. It will have been seen that—in addition to the difficult task of having to decide whether we are to retain or relinquish our long-held naval primacy, and as to what new ships should be like—our authorities will find themselves 'up against' financial obstacles of an exceptionally formidable character.

They will be faced with other difficulties, not so pre-eminently important as those already mentioned, but still perplexing enough. A navy does not consist of capital ships alone. There must be—as just hinted—several different classes of vessel. The arrival and the certain future development of the submarine and the aircraft will tend to multiply these classes and also their individual components. The history of war shows that every form of attack, however novel, evokes methods and appliances to counteract it: and so does every form of defence. The answer to defence is improved attack; and it is almost a commonplace of war doctrine that the attack is superior, in general, to the defence. It in no way detracts from the value of the capital ship that, as long as there are torpedo craft—either on the surface of the sea or under it—she must have satellites specially qualified to deal effectually with such craft. If, again, she is to be liable to attacks from the air she must have suitable means of meeting them. All this will inevitably involve the necessity of maintaining, expanding, and very likely of inventing special classes of craft for use in offensive defence in the air, and on or even under the surface of the water. We can draw an instructive parallel between the development of warfare on land and warfare on the sea. On land—to adopt our own English nomenclature—the different 'arms of the service' support one another; no one would think of having an army composed entirely of artillery or of infantry or of cavalry. So, on the sea as warfare developed—became more complicated in fact—special classes of vessel were seen to be more and more necessary and their functions became more highly specialised. Here again it will be found that the question of cost will be very prominent.

Having taken a rapid view of the course of our pre-war 'building-slip' competition with Germany, we may—without in any way prejudging international conditions—see what would be likely to happen should the United States and the British Empire (for it will be the British Empire and not Great Britain alone) engage in a similar competition. About the middle of January 1921 the United States Secretary of the navy communicated to a committee of the House of Representatives two sets of figures belonging to what is called the '1916 programme.' It is well known what these figures import. It is that there is in contemplation an increase of the United States' navy that will make

it, by a good way, the greatest—at any rate in tonnage—in the world. For the moment the most interesting thing which can be extracted from the figures is the increasing displacements of individual battle-ships. As already stated, our latest capital ship displaces 41,200 tons. The six American ships, the names of which come lowest on the list—thereby indicating the most recent date of design—are to have a displacement of 43,200 tons, thus surpassing our Hood by no less than 2,000 tons. The heavy guns proposed for these ships are to be twelve 16-inch guns, 50 calibres in length. It may be well asked, is there to be no limit to the size of men-of-war? Anyhow, it can be seen what competition in bigness would be pretty sure to involve. Naval megalomania is evidently a widespread disease. We used to be told, in the old Latin Grammar, that Hippomanes was 'a raging humour in mares.' Are we to translate megalomania as 'a raging humour in navies?'

Whilst the disease is prevalent, strategy—in accordance with a favourite recipe of the material school—is put on the scrap heap. This could be demonstrated at length. Here it will be sufficient to mention one or two of the morbid effects of ignoring strategy. For the modern man-of-war docking—even when serious repairs are not necessary, as would often be the case after a battle—and docking at relatively short intervals are indispensable, if efficiency is to be maintained. Every large increase in displacement, renders docks—sometimes many of them—practically useless as far as the more important classes of ships are concerned. As it will always be an object not to operate in war too far away from places where suitable docking accommodation would be available it is plain that restriction of the accommodation will react unfavourably on the mobility of fleets. It may also be said that great size of individual ships will render certain channels or canals impassable. Will displacements exceeding 43,000 tons allow of passage through, say, the Suez Canal? Will they allow of passage through the Panama Canal? To enlarge the canals or make new ones will cost money. Will it be better to spend that money in adding to the number of ships? These questions will be raised if naval strategy is to have 'a look in.' Not a few years ago, when displacements were rising notably, it was suggested that a chart of the world should be prepared showing the anchorages, hitherto accepted as useful and convenient, which

the tendency to make men-of-war bigger and bigger would render inaccessible to fleets. A chart of the kind would be interesting just now.

It could be shown in detail that patients who suffer from megalomania take only a languid interest in tactics. Let one illustration suffice. In Admiral of the Fleet Viscount Jellicoe's book, 'The Grand Fleet, 1914-16,' there is a diagram (II.) which is worth examination. It is, to be sure, hypothetical, as it is meant 'to illustrate the situation that might have arisen 'had the battle-fleet deployed on the starboard wing column.' It is also put forward as a defensive argument to justify the adoption of another manœuvre. These two points have to be taken into account. No serious student of tactics will maintain that the situation depicted in the diagram would be impossible. Some people would think it probable. A few would regard the situation, in the circumstances assumed, as certain to occur. What the diagram tells us is that in a particular manœuvre a numerically superior fleet of the biggest ships afloat—in spite of the bigness of its individual components—would, for nine minutes, be exposed to a much greater volume of hostile fire than it could itself deliver. In the conditions assumed bigness alone would not have been of any tactical value. One wonders if sufferers from naval megalomania could look for a cure in the frequent playing of 'war games.'

It is possible to hold that the capital ship still has her place in fleets, and at the same time to believe that she must be subjected to very great modification in dimensions, design, and armament. It is submitted that we shall never reach any useful conclusion as to the capital ship which we ought to have unless we study the history of the method adopted to 'protect' ships with armour—that is, furnish them with passive defence. Here only a rapid sketch will be required. In naval matters the word 'protect' does not leave a nice taste in the mouth; but it has been used so often and for so long a time that we must put up with it at least for the present.

The modern armoured ship owes her existence to a decision arrived at in the middle of the last century (that is to say within the memory of people still living) to introduce into navies a branch, and not the most important branch, of warfare on land. The intention was to imitate afloat, as far as maritime conditions

permitted, the massive fortifications which were common on shore. Ships were to be made into floating forts. With a lack of humour that is really startling some people called men-of-war by that name. The consequences of the decision are to be observed at the present day. In our latest battle-ships, whilst one-third of the weight is assigned to ' protection,' only one-sixth can be spared for offensive armament. It was a complete reversal of the long established principle that a man-of-war was intended to hurt the enemy rather than to shelter herself. From 1815 to 1914 the only great European war in which this country engaged was the so-called Crimean war. As Lord Sydenham has told us, ' The operations all turned practically on the defence ' of three entrenched positions.' For us the one great operation was the siege of Sebastopol. Not unnaturally, we ' got fortresses ' on the brain.' We started fortifying a multitude of spots—not in the United Kingdom only, but also throughout the Empire. ' Thus we have seen waves of coast defence which have strewn ' our shores with derelict fortifications technically bad even in ' their day, and now worthless, etc.'

When we had spent huge sums of money and burdened the earth with unnecessary masonry a prophet arose who turned men from the adoration of ' monumentalism ' in works of defence to a simpler faith. He began a campaign against megalomania in defensive policy, and that campaign has had memorable results. He formulated his views as to the necessity of reformation in a volume on ' Fortification,' and the effect was nothing short of astonishing. The Wittenberg Theses of an earlier reformer ' weren't in it.' Megalomania was banished, not indeed instantly but within a short time, from the land defence policy of every country in the world. A few ' monumental ' fortifications remained simply because they were there. This modern reformer we knew as Sir George Clarke. As Lord Sydenham he has been spared to see the justification of his theses in the twentieth century history of Liège and Namur.

As might have been expected, a counter-reformation ensued ; it began and progressed—of all places in the world—in the British Navy. Megalomania expelled from the land service infected the sea service with ominous rapidity and devastating results. Sailors were set to study land fortification. An instructor in that subject was included in the ' faculty ' of the

Royal Naval College at Portsmouth. The pupils started on the ' first system ' of Vauban, and talked gravely of ravelins, tenailles, and counterscarps. It did not require any exceptional gift of perception to see that the aim of the systems of fortification studied was not so much to hurt the enemy as to keep yourself from being hurt. The thousands of tons of armour carried by the most modern battle-ship, the ever increasing dimensions *hinc causas habuere*.

There began a fierce and long continued contest between armour and the gun. It occurred to some of us that it was the armour and not the gun that was going to be defeated in this costly and needlessly protracted contest. We believed and still hold to the belief—' super-Dreadnoughts ' notwithstanding—that there is only one way of defeating the gun, and that way is by providing yourself with the means of delivering a superior volume of fire. That can be done by methods which need not be specified here ; this is not meant to be a treatise on naval tactics. All that has to be said now is that the thickest armour in the world and even ' super-Hood ' displacements will not release you from the obligation to conform to the principles of tactics ; and, after all, there is really such a thing as naval strategy, however contemptuously the members of the material school may look down upon it.

To show the extent to which the futilities of monumental fortification discarded by the land service were taken over by the sea-service it may be mentioned that even the obsolete nomenclature of various ' systems ' was adopted by and was acclimatised in the navy. Our first turrets were called cupolas; Captain Cowper Coles—the inventor of them—came to be known as ' Cupola ' Coles. The turret itself was a land-service device and it had a land-service name. We had barbettes, glacis, batteries (in the technical sense), and casemates. There was one class of battle-ship which had a citadel, and also caponiers on the roofs of the turrets. Apparently we did not have tenailles ; but there was an attempt to introduce reduit—the name if not the thing itself—and that attempt, for a time at any rate, failed. One sometimes felt inclined to say, ' How the soldiers must be ' laughing at us.' Whilst we were garnishing the language of the quarter-deck with the leavings of Vauban, Coehorn, &c., we were ignoring the doctrines of attack and defence which fortification

directed by sound principles could teach us. We put, so to speak, our ' bottom dollar ' on defence. The offensive form of defence had no attractions for the material school. It was in vain that Admiral Farragut—who had ' seen blood about the decks '—told us that ' the best armour is the return fire.' It was equally in vain that Admiral Sir Reginald Custance told us that ' to silence the enemy's guns was the best defence.' The late war on land could teach a lot to sailors who are ready—as most sailors are—to be taught. The ' trenches ' were originally meant to afford protection. When our armies on the Western front were on the defensive their aggregate casualties were higher than those suffered in all their gallant offensives put together. Three weeks in the trenches were more costly in casualties than a big offensive. ' Ships can be beaten without their armour being ' perforated,' says Admiral Sir R. Custance, who confirms the statement with an actual example. Did the Falklands, or the Doggerbank, or Jutland lend any support to the expectation that armour will secure you against risk, or to the policy ' founded ' chiefly on the defensive and looking to a reduction in the risk ' incurred ? '

Consideration of the weapons almost sure—some or all of them—to be employed in naval warfare should enable us to arrive at a fairly satisfactory conclusion as to their respective importance. There will probably be the gun, the torpedo, the aerial bomb, the depth charge, the drifting mine, the ' aerial torpedo,' and—if we may call it a ' weapon '—the moored or stationary under-water mine. Only one of these can be rightly termed an ' arm of ' precision ' ; and that is the gun. Up to the present the torpedo can be counted on to hit its mark only once in twenty times. Even when not disconcerted by the attacks of an enemy's air-craft, an unlikely condition, the percentage of hits to be obtained by an aerial bomber would not be high. The depth charge would be directed against an invisible object at an unknown distance. The drifting mine must by its nature be the sport of the current or of the local tides. The chances of hitting the object by the ' aerial torpedo ' may be greater than if it were merely a bomb ; but they can hardly be much greater. The stationary under-water mine does not even try to hit its object ; the object has to hit it, or at any rate to get within almost touching distance of it.

Compare with these restricted capacities the capacity that the naval gun has, over and over again, proved itself to possess. Within its range—which may be a long one, say ten land miles—if the object is visible, its distance known, and the gun accurately aimed or ' laid ' the mark must be hit. The so-called ' straddling,' that is the fall of a projectile just beyond and of another just short of the ship fired at, or *vice versa*, only indicates that the range is not exactly known. The point between the two ' straddlers ' is the precise range ; and when the gun is laid for it and fired the object will be hit. Accurate allowance for the movement of the firer's ship and also of the ship fired at can be and is regularly made with suitable instruments such as those due to the surprising inventive fertility of Admiral Sir Percy Scott and others. It will, surely, be recognised that—on the sea—the gun still is and promises to remain the ' queen of weapons.' The sole object in loading ships with thick armour is to defeat the gun and give safety to ship and crew. The armour does nothing and can do nothing to hurt the enemy. We may see where this ' playing ' for safety ' has led the navies of the world.

The Queen Mary was a battle-cruiser with a displacement of 27,000 tons. The weight of her armour and deck protection was 6,200 tons ; of this weight the armour proper answered for 3,900 tons. This means that she had to carry about with her 3,900 tons of inert metal which by no possibility could do any harm to the enemy. More than that, it absorbed about 9,000 tons of her total displacement. Notwithstanding this, she was destroyed by gunfire. The German battle-cruiser *Lutzow* was of nearly the same size as the Queen Mary, her displacement having been 26,180 tons. She had between 5,000 and 6,000 tons of armour. She also was sunk. The merit of all this huge weight of armour is not easy to discover. It is quite clear that it utterly failed as a reply to the gun. If, as experience has made absolutely certain, there is only one way of defeating the gun, and that that way is to possess ability to deliver a superior fire, may not the following question be reasonably asked ? Would it not have been wiser to devote most of the third of the displacement of either of the two ships named to the work of carrying about a more powerful armament ; not necessarily of guns with greater calibres, but of more guns of adequate power ? The Queen Mary was destroyed by the ships of a fleet which, by our own admission, carried no

gun of larger calibre than 12 inches. Advocacy of a more powerful armament very likely involves advocacy of more numerous ships ; which, in turn, would necessitate adoption of smaller dimensions. The matter might be discussed at considerable length ; all that need be pointed out now is that had there been three vessels of 9,000 tons displacement each, not more than one of them could have been blown up and sunk by the salvo which rapidly destroyed the one ship of 27,000 tons. Besides this, it is quite certain that one torpedo could not destroy all three ships, though they might be of but 9,000 tons. Great size of ship—megalomania again—means a bigger target for a submarine, and also for above-water torpedo craft. It does not give security against either locomotive torpedo or mine. The Formidable, it is true, was what is called a ' pre-Dreadnought ' ship. She was, all the same, of 15,000 tons displacement and had cost over a million sterling. Yet she was destroyed by a torpedo. The Audacious was a ' super-Dreadnought ' of something like 25,000 tons displacement ; yet she was sunk by an under-water mine, the explosive effect of which may not have much exceeded that of some locomotive torpedoes believed to be in contemplation.

The contest between the gun and armour has been going on for at least a whole naval generation. Advance in the power of the gun has been met by an increase in the thickness of armour, in its amount, and, of course, in its weight, and in the dimensions of the ship carrying it. At last, so it was regularly alleged, we have secured the ship against gun-fire. In 1914 was the armouring of the Queen Mary believed to be satisfactory ? Did experience justify the satisfaction ? Are we to be told now that, at latest last, the problem of defending a capital ship with thick armour has been solved ? What reason is there to feel certain that this allegation will be more accurate than many similar allegations in the past ? At the long ranges now possible for ships' guns, armour perforable at moderate ranges may, no doubt, prove effective. Will that be due to distance or to thickness of armour-plate ? At Jutland British battle-ships, as distinguished from battle-cruisers, were not subjected to very serious hostile fire. Their armour, as regards resisting efficiency, was not put to any conclusive test. Is it considered to be so satisfactory that it will not be modified in future designs ?

The greater part of a capital ship's armour is composed of

thick plates intended to keep out heavy shells. A smaller part, of thinner plates, is intended to stop lighter missiles and to localise the effect of shells that may burst inboard. This arrangement, which may be referred to as ' protection,' promises, within its narrower limits, to be suitable and efficient.

It is submitted that it would be worth the time and trouble spent on the job, if someone would work out the resultant efficiency of a fleet which had abandoned thick armour whilst retaining reasonable arrangements for localising the effect of shells bursting internally, and which could deliver a greater volume of fire than the present allocation of but one-sixth of the displacement allows.

We should learn from such an inquiry as is suggested whether we have reached the limit of megalomania, and if we might not expect reduction of dimensions without loss of efficiency. The ratepayers and taxpayers, *taillables et corvéables à merci et à miséricorde*, would probably like to be relieved of the burden of paying millions in order that certain classes of ships may carry about the world thousands of tons of armour which by no possibility can do any harm to an enemy. To anyone who may say, why was not this pointed out before ? the answer is, it was pointed out long ago and often ; but the warning fell on deaf ears. It was beyond measure difficult to get a hearing for views of the kind.

Whatever opinion may be formed of the naval material put into our seamen's hands in the World War, there can be no sort of doubt of the magnificence of their spirit or of the splendour of their achievements. They did the very best that was possible with the material which they had to handle. Splendid as were the performances of the officers and ships' companies of old days, their noble record has been beaten by their successors of 1914 to 1918.

CYPRIAN A. G. BRIDGE.

THE FUTURE OF NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

WITH regard to our future naval construction the main issue can be condensed into two simple questions: (*i*) is it reasonable to suppose that submarine vessels are about to introduce a change in warship construction equivalent to the transition of galleys to ships propelled only by sails, or of sailing vessels to steamers? (*ii*) has the invention of submarine vessels done nothing more than introduce a new arm into military navies, that is to say must underwater ships be regarded merely as an addition to other naval armaments?

The contentions with which an advocate of exclusive submarine construction supports his conviction may be summarised as follows:

Between 1916 and 1918 German submarines produced a state of things almost equivalent in its results to a defeat of our battle fleets. Our trade routes were being attacked with such success that our power to feed ourselves, or even to maintain the armies that we had transported overseas, was in jeopardy. Our blockade of the German coasts was, it is true, not disputed; but, as our control of the sea was no longer sufficient to secure the necessities of our existence, the forces by which that blockade was maintained were already useless and superseded. Admitting that the German campaign did not succeed, its failure was due to the policy that built up the German Dreadnought fleet. Had the material and labour expended on German Dreadnoughts been devoted exclusively to building submarine commerce raiders, then the attack upon our lines of communication, nearly successful as it was, would have been made in such strength as to ensure our paralysis and exhaustion. Even if submarines cannot attack surface warships with success, they can definitely cancel the advantages that have hitherto accrued to a maritime Power which has defeated or dominated its opponent's battle fleet. All that a naval Power need now do is to construct as many submarines as its resources allow, and then, though its opponent may for a time impose blockade by means of a force of cruisers supported by a battle fleet, the commercial and financial

exhaustion of that opponent will none the less be a matter of certainty, for its trade routes will be subjected to an attack too strong to be parried or defeated. Germany failed to inflict this disaster upon us simply because she had not concentrated her naval effort on submarine construction. Leaving this general line of argument, the advocate of submarine construction concludes, that, even when two battle fleets are in contact, underwater craft can make a decision by artillery fire impossible ; and, in support of this last contention, Admiral Jellicoe's plan of battle, drawn up in October 1914, is quoted to show that a squadron of super-Dreadnoughts, capable of developing an enormous artillery fire, will, on the confession of its own commander, be unable to force a decision if faced by a determined counter attack from a few submarine vessels.* If therefore submarines were capable of so limiting a battle fleet's power of offensive action in 1914, the imagination is not over-taxed if called upon to conceive a state of things in which the most powerful battle fleet will be at the mercy of a submarine opponent.

In reply to this, it is argued : that the success of German submarines was due, not to the intrinsic nature of their attack upon commerce, but to inadequate counter measures ; and that when, finally, we were on the point of mastering the submarine menace, our success had been achieved by surface ships ; which, in their turn, derived their ability to operate from our battle fleet. No counter measure, whether of convoy, patrol, or direct attack by mines, nets, or decoy ships, was possible without the support of a battle fleet capable of keeping the seas secure for the special forces entrusted with the anti-submarine campaign. The German submarines were, moreover, enabled to achieve the results they did by virtue of the German High Seas Fleet. So long as their battle fleet was in sufficient force to control the German Bight, to protect the German coasts from attack, and to prevent the access of our fleets to the Baltic, their submarines were able to get out into the North Sea, from whence they could attack the terminal points of our trade routes and our lines of communication. Had the German naval forces been composed exclusively of submarine vessels we should have held them to great disadvantage, for, thanks to a fleet of capital ships enjoying

* See Battle of Jutland, Official Despatches, pp. 601 *et seq.*

almost complete freedom of action, we should have taken measures which, from the outset, would have paralysed the underwater attack upon our trade. Islands off the German coast would have been seized and fortified, access to the German rivers would have been blocked with mines, nets and obstructions ; the Baltic would have been occupied and patrolled, and, apart from the military advantages of such a situation, a barrier of light forces and a whole series of preventive measures would have contained the German submarines in their ports.

Just as our battle fleet made it possible for the naval forces to conduct a counter campaign, so it was only the German battle fleet which gave their submarines a means of attacking our commerce. In war there is no form of attack in itself irresistible. A new arm, or a novel tactical device, may win successes by the element of surprise that it contains : experience of its use teaches how it can be mastered.

Nor will the opponent of the submarine theory admit that any general conclusion can be formed from Admiral Jellicoe's plan of conducting a naval action. In the letter quoted, the Commander-in-Chief said simply that he did not intend ' under any circumstances ' to take the fleet into waters favourable for attack by enemy submarines ; a statement which, if read with the context of the letter, meant that certain areas of the North Sea would not, as far as we were concerned, be good places for a fleet action. Admiral Jellicoe's letter was the outline of a general plan ; and no such situation as he then contemplated arose later. No submarines were engaged at Jutland, when the Commander-in-Chief's most criticised manœuvre was occasioned by the enemy's flotillas ; and arguments with regard to attacks from destroyers, moving at 30 knots and capable of concealing their movements by smoke-screens, are not valid if applied to submarines, with a speed and manœuvring capacity which are, of necessity, much lower.

In conclusion, the advocate of surface ships argues that, however successfully a submarine fleet can attack sea-borne commerce, it can do little or nothing to maintain a flow of trade to its own ports. Nor can submarines, however numerous, transport armies overseas for the support of possessions attacked by a superior naval Power.

This assertion can be made clear by a concrete example. A very large fleet of enemy submarines, with detachments stationed at the principal ports of the German colonies, might have rendered our operations against Germany's oversea possessions more difficult of execution than they actually proved. We might, for instance, have found that the maintenance and supply of each expedition demanded so large a force of protecting cruisers that we should have been compelled to reduce the German colonies piecemeal instead of all together. But such an achievement would have been an inconvenience to ourselves, rather than an advantage to Germany; for she would still have been isolated from her oversea possessions, unable to supply her colonial squadrons of submarines with the torpedoes and munitions necessary for their operations, and powerless to reinforce her colonial garrisons against an attack which had been delayed without being averted.* Control of the ocean highways, in fact, still falls to the Power that possesses the strongest battle squadrons, and the most powerful surface fleet.

These are, in outline, the two opinions now in conflict, and, if they are to be appraised correctly, the following points must be borne in mind. Both sets of ideas are based on the experiences of the war. The submarine school believes that the German underwater fleet *might* have ruined our naval position without defeating our surface squadrons in battle: the conservative school believes that our naval forces were *on the point* of defeating the German submarine onslaught, when the Armistice put an end to the struggle. Both arguments are therefore derived from an experience of war not sufficiently protracted to put the matter beyond all doubt. They are a mixture of fact and reasonable conjecture. And it must also be remembered that all rules about the conduct of war at sea are, of necessity, well compounded with guess-work; for naval operations do not, like land war, subject

*These opinions are held by certain naval officers to-day. The views expressed can only be discussed on the basis of technical data: the range of action of the largest type of submarine, her munition carrying capacity, etc. It must therefore be borne in mind that the above paragraph represents the case of the most convinced advocate of capital ship construction, and that certain naval officers of the same school would hesitate, on technical grounds, to put the matter so strongly.

ideas formed in peace to the immediate and continuous test of battle ; and it is just because conjecture contributes so much to the theories of naval experts that their controversies should be adjusted to the perspective of history rather than judged by the details of the matter disputed.

Now if the capacity of our battle fleet in November 1918 be compared with that of our squadrons at the close of the Napoleonic wars, so great an alteration is at once apparent that the arguments of the advocates of submarine fleets seem very strong. At the beginning of the nineteenth century any Power whose naval forces had defeated or contained those of its adversaries enjoyed the following military advantages. Its battle fleets could : (*i*) impose blockade ; (*ii*) secure its own coasts against all attacks beyond casual raids ; (*iii*) secure its trade against everything but insignificant losses ; (*iv*) transport armies overseas and conduct combined operations undisturbed ; (*v*) isolate the enemy's overseas possessions and allies ; (*vi*) move and concentrate as it wished.

In 1918 the fleet's capacities were much reduced. It could, indeed, impose blockade, secure its own coasts, isolate the enemy's overseas possessions, and conduct combined operations ; but the trade routes and sources of supply were in danger, and consequently the power to maintain armies in overseas theatres of war was jeopardised. This phrase must be understood in its most literal sense. We did actually maintain large overseas expeditions to the very last ; for the armies which overthrew the Turkish Empire were supplied by sea transport. But as an intense struggle for the control of the trade routes was in progress when hostilities were closed, and as the outcome of that struggle was undecided, it was doubtful whether we could have gone on supplying distant expeditions of the kind. The movements of our main squadrons were moreover only relatively free, since whenever the fleet put to sea its liberty was restricted by mines and by the numerous measures necessary for its protection against submarine attack. In each case, the reduction in power was due to the enemy's underwater craft. But it was only the fleet's inability to protect commerce that really mattered ; for the most casual survey of Lord Jellicoe's book on the Grand Fleet will show that the fleet's power of unrestricted manœuvre was never seriously impeded.

The claim advanced by some persons, that submarines can render combined operations impossible, does not bear examination. It is quite true that submarines in the Ægean altered the naval side of the Dardanelles operation ; but although the composition of the naval force engaged was modified, and although the military rôle assigned to the squadrons employed changed as the campaign progressed, a squadron of surface ships was kept on the spot to the last, and was always capable of performing the naval duties of a combined operation.

The situation may therefore be summarised by saying that although ' Control of the Sea ' rested with the superior naval Power, that control had come to have a relative meaning ; and could no longer be used in the absolute sense which our national prejudices had hitherto attributed to the phrase.

Now, if we pass from this comparison between the battle fleets of 1814 and 1918, and survey the wars in which this country has been engaged since the sixteenth century, it will be seen that only on three occasions—when we were at war with the Dutch—have we been opposed to a genuinely maritime Power. The wars against Philip II, against Louis XIV, Louis XV, the Convention, the Napoleonic Empire, and finally, against Hohenzollern Germany, were waged with Powers whose ideas of war rested upon continental campaigns, which in their turn were the outcome of continental policies. But in the three Dutch wars of the seventeenth century we were at issue with a nation whose military force was on the sea, and whose conception of naval war was to oppose our battle fleets with squadrons as nearly equal to our own in gun power and equipment as the whole resources of the Dutch Republic could make them.

The difference between these two kinds of enemy is this : that a continental opponent will endeavour to force a decision on shore and maintain a defensive attitude at sea ; and that a maritime State will seek a final decision with its fleets alone, if conditions allow. This statement is illustrated by a further comparison between the Dutch and French wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In those contests the Dutch strove persistently for a decisive victory on the blue water, until compelled by invasion to concentrate their resources on a land campaign : the French endeavoured, with an equal singleness of aim, to avoid a decision at sea and to force one on land.

This defensive strategy, which a continental Power is usually obliged to adopt, involves certain heavy disadvantages. Control of the ocean routes passes to its maritime opponent, trade and foreign intercourse cease, financial and economic conditions at home deteriorate, and, with them, the fighting spirit of the population. If anybody imagines that it is only possible, under modern conditions of commerce and exchange, to reduce a country to the condition of Germany in 1918 by a ruthless use of sea-power, he had better study the state of France at the Peace of Utrecht or at the close of the Seven Years War. The position arising from this surrender of the ocean highways may therefore become sufficiently serious to compel a continental Power to substitute some more active policy at sea for the original attitude of pure defence ; and the German submarine campaign represents this transition from a passive to an active naval defence. It has in fact a long genealogy in naval records, for never in history have our continental antagonists allowed the British Navy to exhaust their strength and resources without some counter effort, but, as their resources have been concentrated upon armies and land campaigns, the method of obtaining redress has always borne the imprint of a theory of land war ; and it was always hoped that by some special stratagem land forces might be used as a counter to our fleet.

The remedy was, in fact, in the nature of a trick, to deprive us of our command of the sea without defeating our fleet in battle. Consciously or unconsciously, the idea prevailed that if, by some *coup de main*, continental war with trained armies could be carried across to the vital centres of Great Britain, then our fleets would be rendered useless, and their strangle-hold relaxed. And so it has come about that ' invasion ' has been the dominant idea in all plans conceived on the continent for cancelling and annulling our command of the sea. The Armada, the projects of Marshal Belleisle and of Napoleon, are all variants of the same central idea : ' Carry an army across the sea by evading the ' opposing fleet, and let the forces thus transported be so numerous ' and so equipped that they will be able to win a Pavia or an ' Austerlitz five days after landing, and then stoppage of trade ' and foreign intercourse, with all its consequences, will be a ' thing of the past.'

This old stratagem for circumventing the Power dominant at

sea never met with the slightest success. If we except a few descents upon Ireland no invasion had ever matured, and in 1914 the altered circumstances of land war made it impossible for the German higher command to entertain such a plan for a moment. Experts might warn the country that our sea forces could not render our coasts secure against raids accompanied by military detachments; both we and the enemy knew perfectly well that invasion, in its wider sense, was a sheer impossibility. But the German military leaders were faced by the old problem. Our fleets commanded the sea, and closed their supplies from abroad; their own fleets could not meet our battle squadrons with the slightest hope of success, and yet something had to be done to make us relax our hold, before their victories in Russia, Serbia, Turkey and Roumania, and their invasion of Belgium and Northern France, were rendered useless by their own economic exhaustion. The German naval command was faced with the same problem that had confronted the ministers of Louis XIV, Louis XV, Louis XVI, and Napoleon.

The plan they devised was in its essential character the same as the old plans. The command of the sea could not be wrested from us: we were therefore to be manœuvred out of the advantages that it conferred by a special stratagem. The German nation could not be relieved from the damaging effects of our control of ocean traffic, so an equivalent damage was to be inflicted upon us by a special plan, and the plan selected was an attack by submarine upon our sea-borne trade. The amazing thing is that the submarine campaign was regarded as a really new thing, and that its similarity with what had occurred in the past was never realised. Public opinion refused to see in it an admission, on the part of our opponents, of a disadvantage that they could not rectify, and, by yielding to the alarm roused by the dangerous nature of the campaign, forgot that the fleet, simply by doing what it always had done, had driven the German naval authorities to a measure of desperation. The alarm was justifiable, but it was not right to say that, because submarines were successfully attacking our trade, they had thereby rendered battle squadrons useless.*

*I do not lose sight of the fact that raiding did cause great loss on at least one occasion, in about the year 1696. The general impression left on posterity has been that expressed by Mahan: that our commerce was never seriously restricted or endangered during the French wars; an idea which will probably be modified by research.

It is not relevant to this enquiry to discover whether the German submarine campaign was or was not on the verge of defeat in November, 1918. The point is that the base of the whole plan was an admission by the German high command, that our grand fleet conferred a military advantage upon us which they were unable to obtain for themselves. Indeed, the reasons given by the German naval authorities for starting the submarine campaign, and their apologies for the ferocity with which it was conducted, are the strongest arguments yet advanced in favour of capital ships and surface squadrons.

There is another consideration which presses with equal force against an immediate departure from our traditional naval policy. If we examine quite superficially the great changes that have occurred in naval architecture in past centuries it will be seen that one type of vessel has asserted its superiority over another by long competition. Naval experts did not wake up on a particular day to find galleys obsolete or sailing ships out of date. And so the mere fact that the question now at issue is debatable shows that submarine and surface vessels are still competing in a contest not yet decided. It would be foolish to prophesy the issue. Aeroplanes, internal combustion engines, X-rays, wireless telegraphy and submarine navigation, should, by now, have taught reserve in forecasting the products of human ingenuity. But, as the arguments of those who advocate exclusive submarine construction derive a great deal of their persuasive force from the country's alarm at an attack upon our commerce, which nearly brought us to ruin, a few words should be added about a feature in our naval policy, which made the submarine campaign peculiarly menacing.

In our long series of wars against France, British commerce was seriously threatened on at least two occasions ; but they were lost in the memory of the rigid grip maintained by our fleets over the trade routes of the world during the latter phases of the struggle. Naval opinion rightly attributed that control to the overwhelming victories which crushed the French fleet. A wrong deduction was made, however, from the excellent maxim that sea power is maintained by the strongest battle fleet ; and the error affected our building policy for a century. It was concluded, from the premise given, that any type of vessel, which did not directly contribute to the strength of the fleet in battle,

was necessarily useless ; and all ships lower in gun power and protection to the battleship were regarded simply as its auxiliaries. It was never properly realised that the demands of sea power have always included much more than the maintenance of battle squadrons. The growth of mining had, it is true, compelled constructors to design vessels adapted to that operation ; but this was almost the one exception to the general rule. The result was that when the submarine danger was upon us it had to be faced by destroyers designed for other purposes, and by a vast flotilla of trawlers and yachts, designed for purposes of trade and pleasure. If naval thought during the nineteenth century had expended a fraction of the energy devoted to other problems in designing vessels suitable for the protection of trade and the patrol of terminal points, the German submarine campaign would have been adequately combatted from the outset.

But it is not likely that in any future war in which we become engaged a submarine campaign will be launched against us under conditions so favourable to the enemy. At the present moment naval experts incline to the opinion that a general system of convoy should be introduced as soon as is practicable after hostilities have started. This decision is significant for two reasons : (*i*) it is a complete departure from the views held at the outbreak of war, when it was thought that commerce would only have to be defended against ordinary cruisers, and may therefore be held as a proof that the higher naval command considers that in the future submarines will be used more as commerce destroyers than as battle units ; (*ii*) the duty of escorting and protecting trade to our ports will be a responsibility so great, and will involve such minute and careful arranging that, sooner or later, naval experts will be compelled to design ships adapted for the purpose. It is useless to speculate on the gun power, the protection and speed of such vessels ; but, in so far as nobody suggests that cruisers for protecting commerce against submarines should themselves be of the submersible type, it may be concluded that the naval authorities still believe that surface ships can hold their own against underwater assailants.

Whilst these reasons argue a certain confidence in the future of surface ships on the part of naval experts, there are considerations which seem to show that they are more diffident as to the prospects of submarines.

When submarine navigation became possible, underwater vessels were regarded purely as torpedo carrying craft, and it was thought that they would compensate for their low speed by invisibility, which, whilst it would protect them against gun-fire, would also enable them to deliver their attacks at close range. But the designs of German submarines departed more and more from this original conception as the war progressed ; until, at the close of hostilities, the resources of German dockyards were being laid out in the construction of large cruising submarines with a considerable gun power and a great capacity for keeping the sea. That is, submarines had developed by substituting the fighting qualities of surface cruisers for their original means of attack. This is more than a controversial point. German constructors were acting on the directions given by the U-boat commanders and the lines along which the designs of submarines progressed reflect the practical experience of those responsible for the conduct of the campaign. If the essential nature of a U-cruiser, built in 1917, was more that of a surface raider than of a submarine, it was only because such men as von Weddigen and Arnauld de la Perière were convinced that a capacity for delivering torpedo attacks from below the surface was not, in itself, enough to enable them to carry out their orders successfully.

The fact that the progress of German submarine construction was marked by a tendency to imitate surface cruisers also proves that the German naval command was then convinced, as our naval experts now appear to be, that submarines could best be used as commerce destroyers and not as battle units. A small mobile submarine, with a large number of torpedoes, may be used against capital ships : a large gun-carrying U-boat will never be a match even for a light cruiser. But an advocate of submarine construction will probably refuse to consider himself beaten by these arguments, and will fall back on the old contention and say : Admitting that submarines are only really successful as commerce destroyers, it has not been proved that they have been mastered as such ; and in consequence we may claim that they are capable of ruining an opponent's commerce and bringing him to destruction.

The reply to this argument contains a good deal of comfort to those whom it alarms. The German submarine campaign did put us into very great danger ; but that danger arose from the

conduct of the campaign and not from the mere fact that submersible vessels were employed in the operations. German submarine commanders were able to sink the tonnage they did by sinking at sight, no matter what was the nationality or cargo of the victim, and this disregard of neutral rights was a violation of one of the military doctrines which von Clausewitz had tried to teach his countrymen. The memoirs of von Tirpitz and von Scheer show, clearly enough, that a submarine campaign, conducted according to Prize Law, would never have achieved the results desired. When they abandoned the rules of war at sea, the Germans violated a basic principle of war by adding a powerful enemy to the coalition against which they were fighting, at the very moment when their own resources were beginning to decline. The doctrine of von Clausewitz, to select your adversary well, and to do nothing that may increase his capacity for resistance or attack had been preached in vain. It is not likely that any opponent with whom we may be engaged will commit the same mistake ; and although we may expect in future wars that our commerce will be attacked and damaged by submarines, we should be unwise to reckon on having an enemy so shortsighted as to endanger his military position by turning powerful neutrals into powerful enemies.

ARCHIBALD COLBECK.

THE COLOUR PROBLEM

1. The Rising Tide of Colour. By LOTHROP STODDARD. New York: Scribners. 1920.
2. Children of the Slaves. By STEPHEN GRAHAM. Macmillans. 1920.
3. Finding a Way Out. By ROBERT RUSSA MOTON. Fisher Unwin. 1920.
4. The Backward Peoples and Our Relations With Them. By SIR H. JOHNSTON. Humphrey Milford. 1920.
5. The Souls of Black Folk. By W. E. B. DU BOIS. Constable. 1905.

'The vision of a pan-Coloured alliance for the universal overthrow of the white hegemony at a single stroke, a nightmare of race-war beside which the late struggle in Europe would seem the veriest child's play.'

WHAT are the grounds on which Mr. Stoddard bases so terrible a forecast? The conquest of the ocean at the beginning of the sixteenth century at last gave to the Nordic races of Europe some relief from the victorious encroachments of Asia, and enabled them to find room for expansion overseas. The industrial revolution of the nineteenth century equipped the white man with new powers, which enabled him to dominate almost the entire world, to increase his numbers from 160,000,000 to 550,000,000, and his wealth sixteen-fold. Phenomenal prosperity had its usual deleterious effects—moral and physical. The over-crowded factory supplanted agriculture. A passion for wealth destroyed older ideals. Theories of internationalism, with unrestricted immigration, began to lower the purity of the race. International rivalries gave birth to pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism, and culminated in the Great War, in which it is estimated that some 50,000,000, including a large proportion of the best, have perished, leaving a legacy of starvation and infant mortality, and of restriction of the birth-rate of the best race-types, due to excessive taxation and cost of living. The spectre of Bolshevism, which would fain enlist all races in the task of destroying those who have asserted their racial and intellectual superiority, stalks in the background.

The material resources of the white races have been dissipated by the war. Its sequel is a peace which is no peace, but the precursor of new strife, which has alienated America from the League of Nations—'the one hope left.' Meanwhile by the close of the nineteenth century Asia, whose warlike races had

at first been impotent against the white man's battle-ships and machine guns, and whose industries had been paralysed by the avalanche of cheap factory-made goods, had learned to apply the white man's organisation and science, which had increased the population of India fifty per cent. She had become impatient of his domination; a genuine renaissance spread through the East, and its results were made patent by the epoch-making victory of Japan over Russia, by which Japan took rank among the Great Powers, and became the champion of race equality. The spectacle of the fratricidal war in Europe—in which both sides lowered their racial prestige by appealing to the coloured races to kill white men—and the events which followed it, are the final causes of that 'Rising Tide of Colour,' which had been gathering steady momentum from the dawn of the twentieth century.

But added to these causes of decline, and (as Madison Grant* shows) even transcending them in importance—if not indeed the ultimate cause itself—was the deterioration of the Nordic race-type by admixture with alien races. Sir H. Johnston in the brochure noted, tells us that 'crosses between Amer-indians and 'Europeans, Mongols, Polynesians, Malays—even between 'Australoids (the Negrotic aboriginals of Australasia) and 'Europeans—are an obvious improvement in physique, appearance 'and mentality on the Asiatic stock'; nor can he conceive 'why there should be this deep-seated prejudice against the 'negro strain among the Western and Northern Europeans, and 'their descendants in North America, South Africa, and 'Australia.' In particular he considers that the Amer-indian tribes would mingle with the white race without any detriment to the appearance or the mentality of the latter.

We may take it, however, I think, that Madison Grant has conclusively shewn that miscegenation between two sub-species of the same race tends to deterioration, and the loss of all that is best in each, while the union of opposite types, such as the Negro or Australoid with the Nordic, rapidly tends to the elimination of the latter, owing to the prepotency of the black race. This is indeed a very serious aspect of the colour problem. It is not a matter of race arrogance, but the exposition of a biological process, by which specialised types are bred out by the Mendelian law. Mr. Stoddard's description of the condition

* 'The Passing of a Great Race.'

of the mixed races of South America can hardly fail to carry conviction as to the vital necessity of preserving the purity of race-types. Sir H. Johnston, however, is concerned to group races according to their standard of efficiency, irrespective of colour.

The coloured races outnumber the whites by three to one. They are more prolific. Their lands are over-crowded. Their struggle for existence has endowed them with a vitality which enables them to flourish under conditions fatal to the white man. Pressure of population and the pursuit of wealth, are impelling Asia to expansion. Not only does she resent the white man's domination, but she covets the lands he regards as his heritage. Only by rigidly guarding his frontiers, and by restriction of immigration, can he preserve his race purity and save himself from extinction.

The coloured races are described as yellow, brown, red and black. Of these the *Yellow* race has through the centuries been notably exclusive, till the barrier in China and Japan was broken down by the intrusion of Europe and America. A race of high intelligence, they were quick to assimilate the science of the foreigner. Eager in the pursuit of wealth they adopted the method of peaceful penetration, except where they were stopped by the white man's veto.

Mr. Stoddard would have us infer that pressure of population has been a strong impelling motive, but hitherto the facts hardly seem to warrant this view. For Japan, indeed, the poverty of her soil, and the rapid increase of her people, has compelled emigration. She has outlets in Manchuria, and possibly even in Eastern Siberia—both climates suited to her people. For supplies of tropical raw materials and food she has free access to British dependencies in the East, where her people are welcomed. The over-crowding of China, however, appears to have been much exaggerated. According to the most reliable figures, its population, exclusive of Mongolia and Thibet, is not more than 156 to the square mile, and inclusive of those areas only 84—as contrasted with 223 in 1911 (probably now 235) in British India.*

*Mr. Rockhill, formerly American Minister in Pekin, a recognised authority, after careful enquiry came to the conclusion that the estimate of population given in the Chinese Government *Gazette*, Feb. 1911 was entitled to more confidence than previous enumerations, and placed the numbers at 320,000,000 exclusive of Mongolia and Thibet. He considers that in the last century the population has increased very little if at all.

Though we may not like to admit the fact, it is the efficiency of these races which constitutes the ' Yellow Peril.' Their capacity for patient conscientious toil, their frugality, and their intellectual and manual ability, threaten the white man not merely with supersession in their markets, but with the invasion of his own. There is but one reply : increased efficiency by the white man and cessation of industrial strife.

Unrest among the *Brown* races arises from somewhat different causes. Over the greater part of the vast regions which they inhabit, the white races claim to exercise a political control—a control which the war, largely by the aid of Indian troops, has extended over large areas hitherto independent of European domination. India, which contains by far the largest agglomeration of the brown races has in addition an economic grievance, as we may learn from the unusually interesting report of the Indian Industrial Commission (1916-1918)*, and asserts (whether rightly or wrongly is immaterial for the moment) that England has, in her own interests, retarded India's natural industrial expansion. Moreover the pressure of population is here a genuine motive for expansion, for, as I have said, her already dense population increased during the nineteenth century by no less than fifty per cent.

Unlike the yellow peoples of China, Japan and Siam, the brown races lack cohesion. Hindus can no more permanently unite with the Mohammedans than water can with oil. Though the former constitute an enormous majority, the caste system on which their social and religious life is based is a bar to national unity. Islam, on the other hand, experienced a revival at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and binds its followers by a family tie of equality—albeit regardless of nationality or race,—and provides a common meeting ground at the shrine of Mecca : ' a living faith, a common language, an inspired book and an ' undying hope.'

How then are the brown man's two demands to be met—room for expansion and abandonment of white control ? The assumption of this control has been due, in part, to responsibilities and obligations thrust upon the Western peoples in their desire to protect the weak and to introduce justice, in part to material interests ; but it is beyond question the former which has been

* Cmd. 51. 1919.

the predominant cause. Leaving aside the French, American and Dutch ' possessions ' in Asia, let us consider the attitude of Great Britain towards these two demands ; more particularly in India, where the congestion is greatest and the unrest most pronounced.

Though it had been in the power of England to assume direct control over the whole peninsula, the ' Native States ' under their own rulers, cover about a third of the total area, and comprise nearly a quarter of its population. In August 1917 the British Government made a formal declaration of its intention to inaugurate a gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government. H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught when opening the new Legislature at Delhi on February 9 ' repudiated in the most ' emphatic manner the idea that the administration of India had ' been, or ever could be, based on principles of force or terrorism.' The exercise of autocracy, he said, had been abandoned as no longer compatible with the principles on which, by the Proclamation of 1858, the British Government had assumed control over the peoples of India. ' In their prosperity will be our ' strength ; in their contentment our security ; and in their ' gratitude our best reward.' ' To-day,' said the King-Emperor in his message, ' you have the beginning of Swaraj (Home Rule) ' within my Empire.'

The desire therefore to meet the demand of India is clear, in order that she may be ' the future guide of the unknown forces ' of Asia.' How then are we to account for the disconcerting fact that the reforms do not satisfy even that class in whose hands the new power will rest ; in spite of the assurance that they are only an instalment ? And will the martial races of India, the Pathans, Punjabis, Ghurkhas and others, submit to the ' Swaraj ' of the Babu and the graduate of Calcutta ? Oriental conceptions of democracy differ radically from those of the West. China is in some ways one of the most democratic of nations, but she has through the ages been subject to a most autocratic rule, both central and provincial.

Lord Sydenham, representing the view of many experienced Anglo-Indians, and speaking with exceptional and recent knowledge, says that India's ' ancient traditions, cherished customs, and ' social structure are fundamentally opposed ' to the new form of Western democratic government.* Since the British Govern-

* *Spectator*, Feb. 5, 1921.

ment stands pledged to grant self-government to India, is it an impossible ideal gradually to transform British-India into ' Native ' States,' so that she should be governed by her own hereditary dynasties, which we have replaced, but whose representatives still in many cases exist, extending to them the principles which have so successfully guided our relations with the Native States in the past ? Under such a system the degree of guidance would constantly decrease, and would vary with the progress of the State up to complete autonomy. If there is to be conflict between constituted authority and the ' small number of Western-educated ' Indians, mostly lawyers,' who form the politically-minded group which has initiated the present unrest, it would lack the stimulus of hatred of foreign rule. It is one thing to excite an ignorant peasantry against an alien usurper, but quite another thing to challenge a native ruler.

' Already,' says Lord Sydenham, ' the Princes and Chiefs are ' closely watching the decline of the British Raj, and their more ' powerful members, who have never tolerated agitation in their ' territories, and have no intention of being dethroned by the ' followers of Mahatma Gandhi, have mapped out the increases ' of territory, which they rightly propose to snatch from the chaos ' which may be at hand.' ' The extremist press,' says Sir V. Chirol, ' has already frequently denounced ruling Princes and ' Chiefs as intolerable obstacles to the democratic evolution of ' Swaraj '* (Home rule). Might it not even be better to grant these extensions of territory to well-ordered States, where no representative of the ancient dynasty is available, than to await their seizure by force ?

It may be, as Sir A. Clarke averred, that it was already too late ; and there are many difficulties, technical (*e.g.* the status of British subjects) and others. In any case it is rash for one who has lost touch with modern India to venture a suggestion where experts differ. But since I left India many years ago, I have lived my life among alien races, and have become profoundly convinced that the best way to deal with them is through their own rulers ; that elected oligarchies and so-called representative assemblies are less likely to ensure the contentment of the people, or to be friendly to ourselves, than the form of government which accords with their racial instincts and inherited traditions. When

* *Times*, Feb. 10, 1921.

progress demands the co-operation of the best intellects in the work of government let the experiment be conducted through their agency. The principle of native rule—so successfully proved in India itself—has been adopted elsewhere in Asia (*e.g.* Malaya) with equal success. Ceylon is in process of developing a more popular form of government, but its mixed population offers a problem apart.

As to the question of territorial expansion : since, as Sir H. Parkes said, a democracy should not admit immigrants to whom it is not prepared to accord equal privileges as to its own citizens—including that of marriage—exclusion has become an instinct of race preservation in Australia no less than in the United States and Canada, ' a gospel which counts for more than religion, for ' more than flag, for more than the Empire.' Cheap immigrant labour forces down the standard of life, and this restricts the birth-rate of the white races, and eventually squeezes them out. Japan herself enforces restriction against Chinese and Korean labour.

What land areas are there available for these tropical races of India—increasing at the rate of some 13,000,000 each decade—outside the temperate zone, which the white man regards as his heritage ? There are indeed great regions in Asia itself which, at present sparsely populated, might under the inspiration of science be capable of supporting large populations—Mesopotamia, Arabia, Beluchistan (eight per square mile) and Persia. Already Indian emigration has extended to Fiji and the South Pacific, to Malaya, Borneo, &c.

Should the white man's veto extend to tropical America and to Africa ? The population of the latter, under the care of the white races, is likely to increase rapidly, for the negro stock is the most prolific of any. Africa is, moreover, essential as a source of food supplies and raw materials, and Europe has opened her closed doors at the cost of many of her best lives and much treasure. The United States is increasingly sharing these resources and markets ; and since the war has in some parts of West Africa almost taken the place which Germany formerly held. There remains tropical America. The description which Mr. Stoddard gives us of what he calls ' Mongrel America,' is indeed an appalling picture of the evils of the mixture of alien race-types—Spanish, Red man and Negro. ' These unhappy

'beings (he says) everyone of whose bodies is a battle-ground 'of jarring heredities, express their souls in acts of hectic violence 'and aimless instability.' 'But for our protection (he adds) 'outside forces would long since have rushed into this political 'and economic vacuum.' He quotes Count Okuma's remark that it would furnish ample room for Japan's surplus. Nor does Latin America ask for restriction or protection. On the contrary, she welcomes Asiatic immigration. 'Half-castes in particular 'rage at our colour-line; they flout the Munroe Doctrine,' and they form the majority of the population. Here then is no breach of trust to subject races, no opening of a door which they would themselves have ably defended had white control not rendered them powerless, as would be the case in Africa. Here is no swarming race filling up its own lacunae. Would the sober, industrious Chinaman, as Mr. Stoddard describes him, or the races of India be worse neighbours than the degenerate races, constantly engaged in internecine strife, which now occupy these lands? May not an imperious veto produce the same predicament in which King Canute found himself?

Let us turn to Africa, and the negro population beyond its confines. How do these questions of colour unrest, of surging tides of surplus population, of impatience of alien rule, affect this vast Continent? The extreme North has for ages been a brown man's land, and a considerable white population has in recent times settled here. England has no foothold except in Egypt, where there is no question of her racial integrity. She is even now proposing to relax her political control almost to vanishing point.

In the South the case is otherwise. Here white races—British and Dutch—have established themselves side by side with the aboriginals; while the brown races of Asia clamour for admission and have already in Natal and the Transvaal found a considerable foot-hold. It is not here—or in the North—a question of race-purity, as in Australia and Canada, and it never has been, for the Kaffir and Hottentot were there before the white man, and their population has not decreased. A settlement which depends on coloured labour lacks the truest foundation of a real colony.

Though hitherto the dominant races in East and South Africa have had comparatively little trouble with the Africans, they will sooner or later have the same problems to deal with as now

confront the United States. Already they begin to echo in South Africa. It may be that the ' Reserves ' assigned for native occupation are too small for eventual needs—if so, they can easily be enlarged. The country is but sparsely populated, but Asiatics are not welcomed, for they claim equality as citizens, and are accused of causing unrest among the Blacks, and of underliving the poorer whites. The example of South America warns us against the introduction of a third race-type. Africa does not seek room for expansion overseas, and as a whole we may accept Sir H. Johnston's opinion, that tropical Africa is still well-disposed towards European control, while endorsing his view that it is a reproach to the South that it contains no institute comparable to Hampton or Tuskegee. From time to time in Moslem Africa a ' Mahdi ' may arise, or (as recently) a Christian ' Elijah,' and mutinies of troops from some real or fancied grievance have in many parts given cause for anxiety. These are the normal experience of early administrations. They lack significance, because they are based on no permanent grievance. They are caused by no pressure of want or hunger, and they aim at no revival of former glories.

The educated native of the West Coast has not escaped the glamour of such phrases as ' self-determination of small nations ' and the like, and so we hear of a ' West African National Con- ' ference,' the product of a group of Gold Coast barristers and intelligentsia. Sir Hugh Clifford, Governor of Nigeria and ex-Governor of the Gold Coast, read to the last meeting of the Nigerian Council a letter from an African chief (of whose ability he spoke in glowing terms) in which he referred to this Conference as a ' monstrous institution.' Sir Hugh added that no recognition has been, or will be, given to it by his Government. It has no claim to be representative, but its aims, though advanced, appear to be in no way disloyal.

The ' Pan-African Conference ' in Paris, though suffering from the same defect, passed a set of resolutions which may be described as on the whole reasonable and thoughtful. Their aspirations for a fuller share in the government—albeit confined to a small group—are not without significance as signs of an awakening to a sense of individual and collective responsibility. The same, however, cannot be said of Mr. Garvey's ' World Convention ' in New York, and its wild schemes of a Black

Republic for the whole of Africa. So long as our rule is just and sympathetic, I have no fear for the result, and no doubt that it is bringing happiness to Africa. 'Unless,' says Mr. Stoddard, 'every lesson of history is to be disregarded we must conclude 'that Black Africa is unable to stand alone. No black renaissance 'impends, and Africa if abandoned by the whites would merely 'fall before the onset of the browns.'

Neither by force of arms, nor by boycott or usurpation of markets, nor by infiltration into white lands, is the African a danger to the white races, though by sheer fecundity he may threaten those regions in Africa where whites have made a home. But the echoes of discontent from his race in America, or even more direct incentives from them, may create unrest and trouble. The most serious agitation—because it was racial—is that known as the 'Ethiopian Church Movement' in Natal and Nyasaland, fomented by negroes from America. Here indeed is a potential source of unrest. What then are the aspirations and the grievances, and what the present condition of the 12,000,000 negroes in the States, whose influence for good or evil may be so potent in Africa? Mr. Stephen Graham has lately made a tour of investigation in the rôle of an impartial observer.

'An *éclaircissement*, a flood of light on these matters (he writes), a warning in such terrible terms as I have made, may save black and white. It may come from a stranger, a complete outsider, with more force than from an American. . . . The fact which I wish to isolate is the growing resentment of the coloured people; the fact that some 12 millions are becoming highly charged with resentment.'

Regarded in some Southern States (he tells us) as animals without souls—without a right to be Christians; deliberately restrained from education and excluded as a rule from access to the public libraries; cheated of their legitimate profits in trade; often subjected to a system of 'peonage' closely allied to slavery, and socially ostracised, the culminating grievance of the negro is denial of common justice and the substitution of lynch law. The indictment on the latter ground is a horrible nightmare. The excuse that lynchings are in revenge for crimes of brutal lust is, we are told, mere camouflage. It is 'the South's' pet 'sport.' No details are spared: the hunting with blood-hounds, the burning alive to the watchword 'make 'em die slow,' the eagerness of the mob to be photographed at the revolting scene

(such photographs even being used as picture postcards), the retention of ghastly relics as trophies and mementos—these are the deep-lying causes of resentment.

'Whilst the industrialised masses of the whites are certainly 'degenerating, the masses of the negroes are certainly rising; 'trouble is bound to arise and retribution terrible.' The return of the negro troops from France, followed by the riot at Houston, Texas, and the execution of thirteen coloured soldiers, has added fuel to the fire. 'I do not believe,' says Mr. Graham, 'that 'there are real conspiracies of negroes, but there is growing 'disaffection. . . . Every negro child is learning that the white 'man is his enemy.' But later he adds that the negroes are arming, and that Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, as the leader of the militant movement, is the greatest force among the negroes to-day. Yet 'There are those who laugh Du Bois to scorn as a Moderate.' To the average Englishman and American, his story will come as a haunting horror, tempered only by the hope—I had almost said the conviction—that the zeal of the reformer had painted the picture in too lurid colours—that such things *cannot* be. Of one peculiarly horrible story the *Spectator* remarks, that it is 'frankly incredible.' That there is attachment on both sides as between a master and the dog which he ill-treats, or that the crimes are reprobated by 'eminent citizens' does not affect the charge against the mobs of Georgia.*

Dr. Moton, head of Tuskegee, wrote to President Wilson warning him of the growing tension, but the letter, whose temperate and practical counsels emphasise the gravity of the case it states, received only 'a conventional reply; the matter 'closed, and things became steadily worse.'

It is not for me to discuss the *Spectator's* suggestions: segregation or a separate law for each race. This is a question primarily for America though, as Mr. Graham observes, 'when 'she takes the moral leadership of the civilised world it becomes 'to a certain extent everyone's affair.' That she will see to it that such charges are refuted, or their causes remedied—and that speedily—none can doubt, for the situation is a danger to Africa and to civilisation.

Mr. Graham writes of what he has seen and proved to his

**Spectator*, Nov. 27, 1920, see also Feb. 5, 1921.

own satisfaction in America : ' his intention is clearly good,' but his comments on Africa are not so well informed. The statement that ' attempts on the negro's part to raise himself by education, ' or by technical skill are looked on with suspicion ' in British Africa ; or that ' the only function from the modern white man's ' point of view is the making of a material fortune,' are gross mis-statements of fact, while the description of ' the new type ' of officer and employer—the man with the whiskey-brain, the ' mind stocked with music-hall funniosity and pseudo-cynicism, ' the grumbler, the man who expects everything to have been ' arranged for his comfort and success before-hand ' is so monstrous a libel on the Englishman in Tropical Africa, that one is convinced that Sir H. Johnston, who, we are told, read the proofs and is quoted in the preceding paragraph as one of ' the genuine type of English gentlemen (which) is passing,' must have demurred to the description. Such random statements weaken the great cause which Mr. Graham has at heart, and regarding which he has first-hand knowledge.

To say that the American negro in Liberia is ' very successful ' in the immense task which he has taken upon himself of educating ' the negro masses of the interior, and in commerce, and in the ' establishment of law and order,' is to state what I understand to be the reverse of the results so far achieved in the Republic, which Sir H. Johnston in this brochure describes as ' ostensibly ' governed ' by him. I have myself received an appeal from the Krumen begging to be taken under British rule. But this is alien to my subject. It is undeniable that the growing hostility of the American negroes to white men, their increasing wealth which enables them to found ' universal negro improvement ' associations ' and to put money into enterprises such as the ' Black Star ' Line, carrying propaganda of hatred to Africa, is a menace for the future.

Let us hear the other side. To turn from Mr. Graham's book to that of Dr. Moton, Head of Tuskegee, is like turning from Ezekiel to the Sermon on the Mount. It is full of hope and goodwill. Like his great predecessor, Booker Washington, he has devoted his life ' to help in the solution of a great problem : ' the human problem of race, not merely changing the modes of ' life and the ideals of a race, but of almost equal importance, ' changing the ideas of other races regarding that race.' We

must, I suppose, discount his optimism, for it conveys a very different impression of the Southern States to that of Mr. Graham. After a tour in Mississippi—one of the worst—he writes: 'I have never felt more hopeful or encouraged about 'my people than I have since my trip'; and his final chapter on the 'Forward movements in the South,' recounts a quite astonishing number of educational and social institutions and agencies for the promotion of the welfare of negroes, and for co-operation between the races.

Dr. Washington, he says, was often criticised by his own people 'for his confidence in the genuineness of the Southern 'white man's friendship for the negro; but in late years the negro's 'confidence in his white neighbour, here in the South, has grown 'to the point where he is turning more naturally to the Southern 'white man, in the confident hope that together they will work 'out, without prejudice or suspicion, the great human problems 'that confront them.' 'The coloured people are meeting with an 'increasingly sympathetic and encouraging response (regarding 'education), both from the State and from private citizens.' 'A group of substantial Southern white men has organised to 'secure for the negro in every community fair and just treatment 'under the law, as well as an equitable share in all those privileges 'and benefits for which he is taxed as a citizen.' A 'Publicity 'Committee' is assisting 'the general movement for inter-racial 'co-operation' by putting before the public 'the hopeful 'constructive things that white people and black people are doing 'together,' since 'instances of friction between individuals of the 'two races are by no means so common as the instances in which 'they co-operate.' All these things he says (and I have quoted but a few) 'shew the hopefulness of present-day events in the 'South.' Incidentally he disposes of the assumption that American negroes are interested in the supposed salvation of Africa. 'They forget (he says) that the negro knows no more 'about Africa or any other country' than most Americans do of England.

How can we reconcile such divergent testimony? The man of affairs will perhaps reply that the evidence of the outside investigator must prevail over that of the idealist; but for my part I know of no book which I have ever read, which has so impressed me with the sense of noble endeavour, and nobility

of mind. The race which can produce such men—and we are told of many of them—must have a future. They are the type of man we should warmly welcome in Africa.

What are the outstanding reflections and conclusions which a study of this supremely important question leaves in the mind? First and foremost the vital necessity of maintaining the purity of the white race-type by drastic immigration laws in those home-lands of the white races which form the irreducible minimum of their requirements. In the existing state of the world it would be a mere 'counsel of perfection,' to urge that the Western nations would be better engaged in legislating in the matter of eugenics than in competing with each other in armaments, and more usefully occupied in opposing to the cheap labour of the East a superior organisation and a better application of science and invention, in lieu of industrial disputes and decreased productivity. These are the defensive precautions. Their urgency and importance should be made known by those who are concerned for the future of Western civilisation, by the aid of organised propaganda.

Next as to our relations with the non-white races in their own lands. We must recognise that the era of European autocracy in Asia is past. They have progressed. The war has left us too debilitated in men and money to accept the responsibilities which we undertook in the hey-day of prosperity. But we cannot lay down the burden without seeing that it falls on the right shoulders. There is no obligation upon us to ensure that, before we hand them over, the Governments in Asia shall conform to the 'sealed 'pattern' of Western democracy. Asia will assuredly evolve its own type, as we evolved ours. It is better that it should not have to begin by destroying before it creates.

In Africa we must continue to guide and control: the keynote of our endeavours being to create a class of rulers fit to assume by gradual processes a limited responsibility, while devoting our energies to raising the ignorant millions to a higher plane by a system of education suited to their needs. In the economic sphere our relations with the brown races must be as unfettered by national 'preferences' as they are with the yellow. Industries must receive equal encouragement with commerce and trade. Where the white man's initiative and capital has brought some technical industry into existence he must be content to leave its direction more and more under local native control. Those

nations which refuse to read the signs of the times, may not merely have a rude awakening themselves, but may endanger the peace of Asia. For the white races do not stand to-day where they stood a decade ago.

Africa is the land of economic development for the white races in the twentieth century. In the common interest the door must be open to all, no matter which particular nation may have accepted the responsibility of political control. And the black man's market must be absolutely free and unfettered by preference, while competition assures him of fair prices.

Next as to the lands available for expansion for the surplus of the coloured races. The white man's science should (with profit to himself) render vast areas in Asia available for increased population, while placing no obstacle in the way of inter-migration in Asiatic territories—including Eastern Siberia. Though the East African littoral within the tropics may, if need be, accommodate a limited Asiatic immigration, the obligations which we have incurred by depriving the African of the means of retaining his lands for his own exclusive use, the rapid increase of his numbers, the economic needs of the white races in view of the failing markets of Asia, the undesirability of introducing a new race-type—all point to the necessity of directing Asiatic immigration to other regions. Tropical South America seems to offer such an opportunity with the approval of its people and Governments, provided that the veto of the United States is withdrawn.

Lastly as to race-feeling. It is reasonable to hope that the frank acceptance of these principles would go far towards the alleviation of existing race-prejudice. The present foci of unrest appear to be in India, Egypt, and among the negro race in the States ; also, according to Mr. Stoddard, in Japan. In India and Egypt Great Britain is doing all in her power to meet the demands of the people. In the United States there is a movement afoot to obtain equal treatment for all, but the anomaly of the vote—promised but withheld—is a matter which calls for the consideration of American statesmen. Japan is a nation which understands and appreciates a policy of race-preservation and of exclusiveness better than any other race under heaven, except the Chinese.

That is the political aspect of the colour-problem ; what is

its psychological aspect? Does colour-prejudice arise from a natural law hostile to the admixture of opposing types—a law which would obviously find its strongest expression in sexual instinct? Clearly not. The large population of half-castes, the offspring of white fathers and negro mothers, both in the States and at the Cape, disproves it.

If then it be but an artificial product, what is its origin and what are its characteristics? It is notable that it is much more strongly manifested by the Nordic races of North Europe than among the Mediterranean races. Its absence in France is frequently commented upon by Mr. Stoddard, and was one of the causes of friction on the return of the negro troops from Europe.

Another characteristic is that it is much more developed among those who have lived among coloured races than among those who have only come in contact with isolated individuals. The Asiatic or the African who visits England is received with little or no colour prejudice, and not infrequently marries a white woman. It is not that the man who has lived amongst them is lacking in sympathy—he may have devoted his life to their welfare. But the idea of marriage between his women-folk and men of a coloured race is to him nauseous. This is alike the attitude of the white man in the Southern States and of the Anglo-Indian.

And what is the coloured man's point of view? One may learn something of it from these two negro writers. Dr. Moton, a pure full-blooded negro, after making a prolonged tour in Europe writes :—

'At the end of this trip I landed on American shores with the feeling that whatever may be the disadvantages and inconveniences of my race in America, I would rather be a negro in the United States than anybody else in any other country in the world. My subsequent experiences abroad have confirmed me in this conviction.'

Mr. Du Bois claims to be 'bone of the bone and flesh of the 'flesh' of the coloured race in the States, but the photograph which forms the frontispiece to his book indicates (like his name) that he has French blood in his veins.

'One ever feels his two-ness (he writes)—an American, a negro, two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings, two warring ideals in one dark body. . . . Why did God make me an outcast and a

stranger in my own house ? . . . The very soul of the toiling, sweating black man is darkened by the shadow of a vast despair. Men call the shadow prejudice, and learnedly explain it as the natural defence of culture against barbarism, learning against ignorance, purity against crime, the " higher " against the " lower " races.'

In Eastern lands, and among the people of Africa, one does not, I think, find any antagonism to the white races as such ; on the contrary, a most cordial goodwill, except among the educated or semi-educated classes. This is not to say that antipathy may not exist against white control—that is another matter. Du Bois, as it seems to me, touches the true cause of real racial bitterness when he says that the negro ' to attain his place in the world ' must be himself and not another.'

It is because he cannot, like Dr. Moton, thank God that he is a negro, but strives to be a white man—perhaps also in the case of mixed blood ' a warring of opposing heredities '—that makes the coloured man hate the white. It cannot be said with any vestige of truth that true learning and culture is despised by the white man when exhibited by a coloured man. It is the attempt to imitate unsuitable Western customs, dress—and even vices—and the absence of racial dignity which excites the white man's contempt, with its inevitable response of hatred.

Here then is the true conception of the inter-relation of colour : complete uniformity in ideals, absolute equality in the paths of knowledge and culture, equal opportunity for those who strive, equal admiration for those who achieve ; in matters social and racial a separate path, each pursuing his own inherited traditions, preserving his own race-purity and race-pride ; equality in things spiritual ; agreed divergence in the physical and material.

F. D. Lugard.

LABOUR IN INDIA

THE last two years have seen wide-spread labour troubles in India, practically every branch of industry being affected. It would be incorrect to regard this labour unrest in India as similar to that at home, or to ascribe the two to identical causes. Labour in India is very ignorant and usually quite illiterate, and many of the aims of organised labour in Great Britain are beyond the comprehension of the ordinary Indian worker. It seems therefore necessary that information concerning labour conditions in India should be made available for those who may be interested in the subject but have no first-hand acquaintance with labour in India. I have been connected with Indian workshops, factories and manufactures for many years ; I have always been interested in the Indian workman and in factory management, and I hope I am an unbiassed observer. To those who know India really well, much that I shall say may appear obvious or even trivial ; but detail is necessary if any clear idea of a varied and difficult problem is to be obtained.

The strikes in India have been spread all over the country ; but naturally have been most frequent in the large centres. During one period of five weeks at the end of 1920 some 36 strikes were reported in one newspaper as in progress, affecting not only the big industrial centres but large parts of the country as well. These strikes occurred among many different classes of labour—engineering workshop men, port employees, post and telegraph servants, jute mill and other factory hands, railway men, gas workers, printers, steamer crews, coachmen and grooms, watchmen, milkmen, surveyors, tramway workers and others. Hardly any industry has been free from trouble with its labour, and many government establishments have been affected. Such widespread and varied unrest demands careful investigation, for the grievances which have made it possible must be in a great degree legitimate and real.

It must be understood that labour in India is practically unorganized and that its sentiments are almost entirely local. Men in one centre have little or no interest in the men in any

other centre, and even railway strikes have occurred in one place only, leaving the rest of the system untouched. Thus a strike in engineering workshops in Calcutta has little effect in itself on similar shops in Bombay, though identical conditions will, sooner or later, bring about a strike in the latter place. The trade union as known at home hardly exists in India as yet; thus there are no officials to represent the men, with authority to put forward grievances, to negotiate and to settle. A strike usually begins with a few legitimate grievances affecting all, or at least the bulk of, the workers; but these workers, being illiterate, have to go to some outsider, frequently a lawyer, to put their complaints in clear form. The outsider, as a rule, knows nothing of the real conditions, nor has he any practical knowledge of the industry, and following the usual custom of the country in litigation he expands the small list of real grievances into a long list of demands, many of which are absurd or impossible. He has no authority over the men and the strike often becomes an orgy of disorder and violence with intimidation of the majority by a few extremists. There is, undoubtedly, political influence at work, originating probably from the non-co-operation fanatics, but such influence would be powerless without a ripe soil on which to work. The ordinary worker of India has little interest in anything outside 'the daily round, the common task,' and is profoundly ignorant of politics of any kind. He wants a quiet life with sufficient of the necessaries of life for himself and his family, and reasonably fair treatment. The main causes of his unrest must be sought in the conditions under which he now lives and works.

Industry on a modern scale is of quite recent growth in India and the standard is far below that obtaining in Great Britain, the United States and other progressive countries. Half a century ago railways and other public utility services were still in their early childhood, while machine factories were few and small. Manufacture was mainly in the hands of individual workmen, belonging to distinct castes; the children commenced to learn their father's trade almost before they could walk. Even now throughout a large part of rural India the individual workman plies his trade in the ancient manner. Once when visiting the great Tata Steel Works at Sakchi I came across a blacksmith, just outside the factory walls, squatting on the ground forging

a small ball of iron with the aid of a tiny boy, who was blowing the charcoal fire by means of a goatskin bellows. There on one side of a wall was the most modern plant for producing steel in hundreds of tons, and on the other side the methods of remote antiquity producing a pound or two of rough iron. This is very typical of India. The twentieth century A.D. and the twentieth century B.C. may often be seen side by side.

With the multiplication and enlargement of factories, and with the great increase in public utility services, came a demand for labour which the immediate locality could no longer supply and wages rose to such a figure as would attract men from the villages and smaller towns. At first men from the proper caste flowed in, but gradually there was a loosening of caste and the ordinary village labourer drifted to the industrial centres. Thus all centres of industry grew to large towns ; but, except where the big railways have established their main shops and have made towns of their own, the growth has not been controlled or planned, with the inevitable result of crowding, insanitary conditions, and lack of ordinary decent living amenities. Rents go higher and higher, distances from work increase and general cost of living becomes excessive.

In the large cities there is often a scarcity of labour, while in the smaller towns where industrial works have been established the scarcity is almost constant. Any enlargement of the field of manufacture is hampered by the difficulty of obtaining labour in sufficient quantity. While it is easy to understand the scarcity of skilled labour in an agricultural country like India, the deficiency of unskilled labour may appear strange. The reasons are simple enough, though a solution may be difficult to find. The Indian is attached to his native place and to his family and does not readily leave them. He may be attracted by high wages to some industrial centre ; but he soon finds that it is impossible to have his family with him, and always there remains with him the lure of his home. Thus in any large collection of workers, there will be found a small number of practically permanent local men, with a large proportion of ' foreigners ' who come and go, as they save sufficient for their immediate wants, or, having spent the accumulation, return for more. The big railways are popular, because they grant free passages to and from their homes to their servants after a certain period of service.

Undoubtedly this lack of continuity in work is mainly caused by the absence of adequate and cheap housing accommodation. If the countryman could obtain suitable accommodation for his family at a reasonable cost, many would have their families with them and all parties would gain. The workman would gain by increased comfort ; for it must be remembered that in the absence of his family he must usually obtain and cook his own food, and this after a long day's work is a considerable hardship. Moreover he would be free from all anxiety for his absent family. The employer would gain by a more stable labour force, by the contentment of his labour, and also by the probability that the male children would be brought up to follow in their father's footsteps. The fact that Indians emigrate to distant countries and that many classes enlist freely in the army, with liability to long absence from their homes, often blinds people to the existence of this scarcity of labour in the country itself and to the reasons which cause this scarcity. I remember a crying need for unskilled labour at a factory under erection near a town devoid of any industrial population. Famine had been declared to exist in a neighbouring district, yet it was most difficult to obtain labour for the factory. The famine district was purely agricultural and no man would move without his family or was inclined to leave his land at all, even temporarily. The people preferred to obtain bare subsistence on relief works rather than go away, without their families, to high wages on strange work in a strange place.

Now the ordinary Indian, even of the labouring class, is, in his village, not unused to certain decencies of life. He is accustomed to washing himself and his clothes, such as they are. His wife has a very fair standard of cleanliness in the house and in her cooking utensils, while the few essentials of life are obtainable at reasonable cost. Moreover many villagers have a plot of land which the family can cultivate while the head plies his trade, or at any rate there is agricultural work to be had to supplement industrial earnings. Usually the villager, and even the townsman working on his own, keeps no settled hours for work; he may be seen at work at almost any hour of the day or night, with frequent intervals for rest, for a smoke or for a chat with a neighbour, or even for a short sleep. There are many festivals or religious holidays, either universal or local, which

provide him with some mild excitement and enjoyment at little cost.

Generalizing, it may be said that the ordinary Indian worker works only that he and his family may live ; that he only works sufficiently long to provide the necessary living expenses ; and that his greatest luxury is leisure. His wants are few, and these supplied he seeks his pipe and the shade of a tree. One grave defect he has from the modern point of view and that is a lack of thoroughness or a desire for efficiency or zeal in the interest of another. Very few Indians are craftsmen in the sense that so many of the Chinese are. They lack a pride in their work and are themselves apt to be content with anything that ' will do.' Some years ago I wished to have translated certain English rules for engine-room and boiler attendants ; but my translator expressed his inability to render the concluding advice into the vernacular. This advice was to the effect : ' Take a pride in ' your work.' The translator said the idea could not be properly translated in the sense in which it was understood in England. A piece of work done by quite an ordinary Chinese or Japanese workman will usually show a ' finish ' which pleases ; but work done by even good Indian workmen will not infrequently lack finish and may even be marred by careless flaws.

I once saw a magnificent carved screen done by a family of wood carvers whose forefathers had been expert carvers for generations ; yet I found much bad wood, even sapwood, had been used in parts, while the various pieces had been joined in a crude way with the commonest iron tacks. Beautiful brass and silver work may often be seen with flaws due to bad preparation of the metal. This lack of thoroughness brings inaccuracy in its train. Often too the workman has no nerve. If one orders a rod of a definite length, the workman will usually bring a rod cut to a greater length. He has been afraid to cut exactly and does not seem to realise that the final cutting means loss of time and of material which must be paid for by someone.

The Indian workman has however many good qualities ; his code may be limited, but it does exist, and he does respond to fair and sympathetic treatment. In his own way he is hard-working, honest and patient, and expects little from the world at large. Left to himself, he is content with little beyond bare existence, and he is usually anxious to give as little trouble

as possible. He hardly realizes the duty of giving a fair day's work in return for his pay, though he is rarely a deliberate slacker. His view, like that of most of his countrymen, is that it is the duty of the buyer to see that he gets what he pays for. If he is not properly controlled he will not exert himself: but if he must he will do a good day's work and have a higher opinion of his employer in consequence. He dislikes anything new or of an experimental nature; but he will learn if treated with patience by men whom he knows and trusts. Cash appeals to him far more than any welfare scheme, yet he can and does recognise the difference between good and bad working and living conditions.

There are worse workers than the Indian and, under the right class of management, there is no reason why he should not improve in every way to the mutual advantage of himself and of his native country. Always there will be the difficulty of his lack of wants; but this will gradually lessen as his standard of comfort advances. At present a steady attendance at work may be merely a sign of indulgence in the vices of the big towns; drink and other useless luxuries have to be paid for in cash, whereas leisure requires no direct payment. The conditions under which the Indian workman lives in the big cities are always indifferent and frequently very bad, even after allowance is made for the normal low standard of comfort to which men of that class are accustomed, a standard extremely low when measured against any known to the British working man. The following is taken from a leading article in *The Pioneer* on 'Police 'Administration in Bengal' and is based on the official administration report for the year 1919:—

> 'It is small wonder that there is a high sick rate when constables have for instance to go on night patrol, ill-nourished to begin with, and without warm clothing or great coats, or waterproofs; ill-shod so that they are liable to contract hookworm, while on finishing their beat they have to return to a barrack which is a leaky, ill-ventilated hovel, where they have no convenience for drying their clothes and where they have often only the damp and mildewed floor on which to sleep.'

This is a pleasant picture of the conditions of life for government servants in prosperous Bengal. The worker usually lives under similar conditions in most of the big cities, where housing accommodation is so costly that he has to be content

with a share of a small room in a slum far worse than anything of the kind in this country. Owing to the crowded state of the tenement, washing and cooking facilities will be scanty and sanitary arrangements often inadequate. The death rate in these cities is appallingly high and the direct loss to industry through sickness is huge. The Indian worker may have to go a long distance to his work, often in the pouring rain ; but he will find no arrangements for storing or for drying his clothes. Washing facilities are practically non-existent, no separate place for rest or for eating is provided, lighting and ventilation are usually very bad, sanitary conveniences may be inadequate and little is done for the treatment of sickness or of accident. The average Indian factory is little more than a collection of badly designed buildings containing a crowded assortment of plant, much of which is of some antiquity.

There is no special provision of schools or hospitals, and the employer has no liability for accidents as in England ; nor is there any insurance scheme for accidents, unemployment or old age. Children work at too young an age and, as technical education hardly exists, there is little chance of the men or their children improving their position. It must be said that little is done for the comfort or for the convenience of the worker either inside or outside the factory ; he is a human machine hired for so many hours a day and he frequently receives less attention than the machine at which he works. There are exceptions, of course, but they are in the minority.

The Indian worker is almost always paid monthly, often late in the month following that for which his earnings are due. Being illiterate he is very much at the mercy of subordinate clerks and supervisors in respect to the amount he receives. Moreover there exists a deep-rooted canker known as ' dustoor,' literally custom, but usually meaning illegal commission or bribery, widespread throughout every branch of life in India. Your servant demands and usually gets a commission from every tradesman with whom you deal. The worker is often bled by those of his countrymen who have any authority or power over him, and unfortunately the evil custom is not unknown among European subordinates also. Promotion, increase of pay and any privileges have usually to be paid for ; the payment goes to the Indian subordinate, but the worker often is led to believe

that it is for the ultimate benefit of some higher official. These exactions, when within ordinary bounds, are seldom objected to by the men ; but it is obvious that they are always a danger to the peace of the establishment, especially as the management will know nothing till the crisis actually arises. In all well managed concerns every effort is made to fight this dangerous practice, but no case is more difficult to bring to a satisfactory conclusion in a court of law than one dealing with bribery.

Another difficulty is the Indian family system. In India the family bulks very large in the community and in the family are included quite distant relations. It is almost a sacred duty for any prosperous member to assist his relations to the utmost of his power, and it is not uncommon to find an office almost entirely staffed with the relations of the head clerk, who may be relied upon to show favouritism to them.

The management of the big public utility services and of the large works is mainly in the hands of Europeans, and though most of the subordinate officials are Indian, the majority of posts requiring expert technical knowledge are filled by Europeans. It is a fact and a lamentable one that little has yet been done in India to prepare the natives of the country to fill positions of responsibility requiring expert technical knowledge. Rarely does one find a workshop of any size without a European foreman, with one or more European assistants.

Now the European foreman or overseer has rarely held any position of real responsibility before joining an Indian shop. He is usually a comparatively young man, skilled for his age at his particular trade, and he is attracted by what appears to be good pay and improved position. Possibly he had risen to some subordinate post in his shop in England or Scotland ; but, on arrival at his new job, he finds himself either at the head of, or, at least, second in command over, a large shop, with a great number of men under him. The men are alien to him in every way, speaking a number of strange languages, with habits, customs and ways of thought which he is unable to comprehend. The shop is very different to any with which he was acquainted at home in design, plant and equipment, while the methods are strange and the staff often inadequate. The climate is unpleasant, even if not actually unhealthy. The pay which looked so large is often found to be little more than equal to the inevitable expenses,

while many of the ordinary amenities of home life are unobtainable or are obtainable only at excessive cost. Free schools for his children do not exist, medical and hospital conveniences are not as at home, cheap amusements are scarce, and there are no easily accessible holiday resorts for rest and change. Often the society of his kind is missing and opportunities for keeping up his technical knowledge are lacking. His family suffers as much as he does and his children may deteriorate under the enervating conditions.

The trials of the European subordinate in India are many and it says much for the sound character of British working men that so many of them do well in the country, not only for themselves but also for the development of Indian industries. The sound man can and does meet the trials in a proper way and overcomes them, but many fail and become a menace to industrial peace, not always from vice but mainly from sheer unsuitability for controlling Indian workmen. Moreover discontent among the higher staff has the worst possible effect on the efficiency and contentment of the whole establishment.

Discontent among the European staff is perhaps more prevalent under Government than under private management ; conditions in private concerns are more elastic and the human element more apparent. The private employer realizes the great value of reward for good work, whereas in Government service good, bad and indifferent are under the same rules ; promotion is mainly by age and there is no clear incentive to individual effort. The rigid methods of administration in India may or may not be the best for efficient working in ordinary government departments consisting mainly of offices ; but they are certainly not the best when it comes to dealing with a large mass of workers and with the efficient working of large industrial or semi-industrial organizations. In India the personal touch is of the highest value ; but without authority and without freedom of action, the man in direct control of any large organisation loses more than half his influence on efficient working and on the well-being of those under him.

The ignorance of the European subordinate of the language and customs of the Indian worker is obviously a very great disadvantage and is also a source of danger. Unfortunately the age at which the foreman arrives in India and his lack of general

education are rather against him in any attempt to study either language or men. The cost of the imported man is also so great that almost all branches of work are understaffed, with the natural result that the workmen suffer from lack of proper teaching and of expert supervision. The ordinary Indian workshop much resembles a British war factory, in that it is full of semi-skilled and unskilled labour, requiring for efficient production a large staff of skilled men for supervision. The vast majority of the native-born staff are but little above the workmen in technical knowledge or in general education, so their authority and value is slight, being as a rule derived from age or length of service only. In every shop there will be found numbers of bright, intelligent looking boys and young men doing ordinary skilled or semi-skilled work, and it seems strange that some at least do not rise to higher positions. Moreover the schools and colleges of India are crowded with youths for whom there will be insufficient openings in the learned professions or even in clerical work.

The need for sound and wide-spread technical education is most urgent. From the point of view of employers it is required because, without an ample supply of well-trained, country-born men, it is impossible to provide the necessary technical staff at a reasonable cost. To India as a whole it is essential, for without trained men with a sound knowledge of industrial work, any real development of industries is impossible. To the native of the country it is an absolute necessity if he is to improve his position in life or to have an opportunity of taking a proper share in the management of his country's trade. Industry in India can never develop to any extent unless the country-born (Indian and Eurasian) is made fit to take a very large share in the supervision and in the management of all varieties of industrial concerns. Apart from all other considerations there is the very material one of cost. The native of the country obviously requires far less pay for comfortable living than a man recruited from abroad, while the climate and the general living conditions are no cause of trouble or anxiety to him. There are attempts at technical education but, except perhaps on some of the big railways, no marked success has been achieved. Either the scope of the education or the system adopted has failed to provide any appreciable number of young men able to rise to positions of real responsibility requiring expert technical knowledge.

A sound apprenticeship scheme at all big works is necessary, with adequate facilities for instruction both in the shops and in the class rooms. The hostel system is essential to ensure moral and physical well-being. Passed apprentices should provide well grounded young men fit for skilled work and capable of rising to junior supervising posts. From the best of these should be selected young men to proceed to technical colleges, where a higher education should be given to form a basis on which further promotion could be looked for. There will be, for many years, the need for the European ; he will be required still as instructor both in the shops and in the technical schools and colleges ; he will be required whenever new manufactures or new processes have to be introduced, and so long as British capital is employed he must occupy many of the higher posts in expert supervision and in general management.

It is evident from the foregoing description of labour conditions that there is much to be done if industrial peace is to be ensured in India and industry set firmly on the road to lasting prosperity. While in a country like India the government must lead the way, employers generally must not be idle. Conditions must be carefully studied, ideals formulated and improvements planned. The Indian of position or of education must assist towards the formation of such public opinion as will lead the employer and the worker to a better understanding of each other's problems.

First among the steps to be taken is the improvement of the living conditions of all classes of workers. Difficult as the problem is, especially in the big cities, it must be faced and faced at once. Here the government should lead the way, not merely by the expression of pious wishes but by action on behalf of its own servants, who are often worse off than the employees of many private organizations. The government should also set the standard which should be enforced on all public and private bodies responsible for the employment of large numbers of the working classes. This indifference to the well-being of the worker is a short-sighted policy, even from the material view of hard cash. It has been proved that the worker living under his own arrangements attends far more irregularly than one living in a provided house, and his health is worse. Moreover, the larger the proportion of men living with their families, the less the risk of strikes. It is the single men, with little to lose, who listen

to the extremist and are easily stampeded into striking. The housing problem is acute in England ; but it is equally acute in India and bitter are the complaints of every class of worker in all the big centres of population. Side by side with the actual dwellings there must be provided the ordinary adjuncts of decent life, schools, hospitals, a clean bazaar, good water, adequate sanitary arrangements. A row of houses dumped on an abandoned field does not constitute a decent dwelling place, though many authorities in India appear to believe it does.

The comfort and the convenience of the worker when at work must also be considered. Clean and tidy shops and pleasant surroundings are valuable assets not only in actual working efficiency but in their effect on the character of the worker. Human beings are not machines ; even in India, they are responsive to their environment. Moreover a good deal can be done to save the worker unnecessary fatigue. There are, for example, many machine processes which can be just as easily performed seated as standing. Frequently one sees tools designed for the burly white man used by an Indian of half his weight and size. A little adaptation would make a vast difference to the worker and improve his efficiency greatly.

The contentment of the supervising staff is all-essential and is worth any cost. In recruiting men from overseas the utmost care must be taken to ensure that they are suited to work among Indians and that they fully understand the conditions under which they will have to live and work. While all that is possible should be done for the well-being of this class, it is essential that the unsuitable or the discontented man be ruthlessly eliminated at the earliest possible moment. At the same time the path to positions of supervision and management should be opened to the youth of India. Not only must the opportunities be made available to the sons of the working classes, but every effort must be made to attract the educated youth. At present the educated classes rather disdain any connexion with industry, except in purely clerical work, though there are notable exceptions. If only some of the young brains of India would give up the idea of clerical or legal work and take to the manufacturing side of commercial life, they would greatly benefit both themselves and their country.

All the necessary improvements will cost money—much

money—and no doubt the cry will arise that the country and the employers cannot afford the expense. Yet money can be raised. Bombay has quite recently raised a large loan for a development scheme. Industry has done extremely well during the past few years and some of the big concerns have paid enormous dividends. There is plenty of money in the country and no better objects on which to spend it could be found than the improvement of conditions for a large number of its inhabitants and the development of its industries.

Above all it is essential to remember that no increase in pay alone will solve the labour problem ; at best such a course is a temporary palliative. Obviously the rate of wages must be a living one and it must take into account the rise in cost of food and of clothing. But when the living wage figure for the unskilled worker has been reached, any further increase may be harmful to industry and worker alike. If the increase in wages cannot be spent in the improvement of comfort, in raising the standard of living, or generally in the well-being of the community, it can only be wasted, either in harmful luxuries or in unnecessary leisure. Higher wages in Calcutta, for example, cannot give better living accommodation to the worker or enable him to have his family with him, for such accommodation does not exist in anything like the required amount ; any demand for better living conveniences would merely put up rents. In fact an increase in wages, without the provision of easily purchaseable comfort, will mean benefit only to landlords and to the purveyors of useless luxuries. The labour problem can only be solved by taking the long and hard road of improvement in conditions ; there is no easy path through increase in pay. If every worker in India had his wages doubled to-day, there would be only a temporary respite from unrest, while work would decrease and vice increase and neither the health nor the general well-being of the workers would be improved.

I have not touched on such suggestions as works committees, or other European-made panaceas for labour troubles, because, while any effective method of giving a voice to labour must have value, the actual needs are so manifest that they need no debate. It is action which is necessary and not talk. India is so fond of conferences, committees, consideration and reference, that it has an unfortunate reputation for dilatory methods. Everyone

who has studied the labour problem carefully and dispassionately knows quite well what is wanted, and no amount of talk can take the place of action. Discontented labour is an even worse political danger in India than in most other countries. A strike which has a very small beginning may easily spread like wild-fire, if similar causes are in operation, and if political extremists, working with those causes as a basis, manage to capture the minds of the illiterate and ignorant workers. Both government and commerce are based on a few large towns and on a very thin network of communications. A wide-spread strike on those communications, with extensive strikes in the big centres, would paralyse commerce and hamper government. Nowhere is the 'fair deal' more necessary between master and servant than in India, and nowhere in the Empire is it more lacking in its true sense.

H. A. Young.

EXTREMES OF MODERN PAINTING: 1870—1920

1. D'Eugène Delacroix au Néo-Impressionisme. Par Paul Signac. Paris: *Revue Blanche*. 1899.
2. Letters of a Post-Impressionist. By Vincent Van Gogh. Constable. 1912.
3. The Art of Spiritual Harmony. By Wassily Kandinsky. Translated by M. T. H. Sadler. Constable. 1914.
4. Essays on Art. By A. Clutton Brock. Methuen. 1919.
5. Modern Movements in Art. By Charles Marriott. Chapman & Hall. 1920.
6. Vision and Design. By Roger Fry. Chatto & Windus. 1920.

FROM the days of Giotto down to the close of the nineteenth century, the main development of European painting was in the direction of a more perfect presentation of 'the forms which 'Nature produces,' to use the phrase of Sir Joshua Reynolds. The invention of photography disturbed the painter's peace of mind and set him wondering what part the representative element really played in a picture. Various art movements which have bewildered the public during the past fifty years have been forms of protest against the general assumption that the representation of nature is the end of pictorial art; but while moderate men have been content to declare that a painting is something more than a representation of nature, extremists have gone to the length of asserting that representative elements are not essential to picture-making.

The coining of the compound 'post-impressionist' and the loose use of the term to cover a number of different and often contradictory movements, has resulted in a confusion of thought. All post-impressionism is not a development of impressionism: much of it is a reaction against the stern intellectual discipline which true impressionism necessitates.

Impressionism is not, as some have ignorantly supposed, the result of myopia, astigmatism, or blurred vision: it is the fruit of the scientific thought and research of the nineteenth century. The movement which began in France in the seventies was based on two great principles:—

1. The instantaneous vision of a scene as a whole, as opposed

to the consecutive vision that sees nature piece by piece.

2. The substitution of a natural chiaroscuro of colour, based on the solar spectrum, for a conventional chiaroscuro of tone based on black and white.

The first was not a new discovery. It was a principle recognised by many of the old masters ; it urged Titian, Rembrandt and others to give greater breadth and less detail in their paintings as they grew older. To throw back the foreground was an old device, and the painters of the Renaissance were well aware of the changed appearance of objects seen in the distance. Leonardo da Vinci describes how the legs of a receding horse first disappear, then the neck and head, till as the distance increases the spectator is aware only of an oblong or oval splash. But though old in practice, the impressionists justified their vision by new arguments. It was pointed out that the lens of the eye, similar to that of a telescope, adjusts itself automatically to any distance required—but to one distance only at a time. If the eye be focussed on a man in a garden, then a tree standing ten yards in front of him and a house ten yards behind him are both out of focus. If the painter begins by looking at the house at the back, his eye will automatically focus itself to that distance and throw the man in front out of focus. If he fixes the tree, both man and house become blurred. And if he keeps changing his focus, his picture will contain so many contesting centres of attention that, in painters' parlance, it will fail to hang together. From this dilemma the artist has but two ways of escape—unless he follow the Pre-Raphaelites and, as Mr. MacColl says, ' put ' into a picture, say of a church, all that could be noticed by ' the architect, by the worshipper, by the dreamer, and by the ' person looking about the floor for pins.'

The orthodox solution of the difficulty, according to academic precept in the nineteenth century, was for the artist to concentrate attention on one particular object and to render the rest relatively to that object. Thus a young painter might be taught to fix a bright sky so that his landscape might fall together with its tones swamped in a dark mass. The impressionists rebelled against this teaching and found their own way of escape by viewing the scene ' broadly,' that is to say by throwing all the objects slightly out of focus. Perfect examples of this principle of impressionism are Camille Pissarro's paintings of the Paris

Boulevards, which portray the bustle, colour, traffic and movement of the streets before the eye has had time to focus on any particular object. He shows us Paris as we might see it the morning after our arrival, when we open a window and put out our heads to receive a first impression. Whistler's nocturnes might also be cited as examples of this practice, and it is important to discriminate between the two main principles of impressionism because there have been many painters—Whistler himself was one—who adopted the first but never put the second into practice.

Yet the second principle is more important than the first and has certainly affected modern painting more profoundly. It came with the shock of a new discovery though earlier painters had been moving in the same direction. Even now to a very large number of persons light and darkness are terms practically synonymous with white and black. Painters in the past have used black when they wanted to darken and white when they wanted to lighten a particular colour, and this rudimentary notion of rendering light and shade is not wholly unpractised to-day. But with the progress of civilisation and the extension of scientific knowledge, the human eye has become capable of appreciating greater niceties of colour and the study of optics has given to modern painters a knowledge of light not possessed by their predecessors. That white light can be resolved into a scale of colours ranging from violet to red, that black is the negation of colour due to the absorption of all colour rays, are facts now known to Macaulay's schoolboy. Pure white and pure black exist only in theory. The surface which appears whitest to us has in it a yellowish or bluish tinge ; the deepest dark we know contains to the sensitive eye traces of blue, green or purple.

The knowledge of these facts about colour and a perception of their truth led the impressionist painters to sweep black out of their studios, to discard all bituminous and earth pigments, the siennas, umbers and ochres, and to paint with a palette composed of the seven colours of the solar spectrum. The change, amounting to a revolution, brought about by the adoption of this palette, showed itself markedly in the painting of shadows. Whereas formerly painters were apt to ask of a grey whether it inclined towards white or black, the impressionist painters enquired whether it was a bluish grey, a pinkish grey, a greenish grey, a purplish grey. Colours were no longer thought of

as dark and light, as warm and cool, but strictly in relation to primary and secondary hues. The polychromatic, as opposed to the black and white view of nature, was emphasised by Claude Monet, Pissarro, Renoir and Sisley, but it had been recognised by Ghirlandaio, Correggio and other great colourists of the past. Delacroix foretold the impressionism (or 'luminism,' as it has been more aptly termed) of Claude Monet when he recorded in his *Journal* his observation of light modifying local colour. Writing of the faces of two peasant boys seen in Morocco, he remarked :—' The one who was yellow-complexioned had violet ' shadows ; the ruddy-faced one, green shadows.'

Monet and Pissarro not only shocked the contemporary public by the prismatic brilliance of their colour schemes ; they offended it by the method in which they placed their pigment on the canvas. Yet the use of broken colour to give vitality to paintings was new neither to French nor to English painting. It was the method of Watteau, and in 1769 it was written of Chardin : ' His method ' of painting is singular. He places his colours one after another, ' almost without mixing them, in such a way that his work some- ' what resembles a mosaic or patchwork.' Constable attributed the brilliance of his green fields to the fact that they were composed, not of one uniform tint, but of ' a multitude of different ' greens,' and Reynolds himself bears reluctant witness to the success of this method as used by his great rival :—

' It is certain that all those odd scratches and marks which on a close examination are so observable in Gainsborough's pictures and which even to experienced painters appear rather the effect of accident than design, this chaos, this uncouth and shapeless appearance, by a kind of magic at a certain distance assumes form, and all the parts seem to drop into their proper places, so that we can hardly refuse acknowledging the full effect of diligence under the appearance of chance and hasty negligence.'

It is idle to quarrel with the method of an artist, since the only thing that matters is whether his skill in the exercise of any particular manner is sufficient to achieve his purpose. Monet is credited with having said in his youth that he would like to paint as a bird sings, and the broken touch, the ' intimacy ' of this method of painting, seems particularly well adapted to the expression of that lyrical spirit which animates his work.

The research into the colour of light, and especially into the colour of shadows, begun by Monet and Pissarro, was further

developed by Seurat and Signac, the leaders of the Neo-Impressionist movement. Writing in 1899 M. Paul Signac said :—

> ' The Neo-Impressionist painters are those who have established, and during twelve years developed, the so-called ' Divisionist ' technique, employing as their method of expression the optical mixture of tones and tints. These painters, respecting the permanent laws of art, rhythm, measure, contrast, have been brought to this technique by their desire to attain a maximum of luminosity, colour and harmony which it has seemed to them impossible to obtain by any other method of expression.'

Here is a prodigious number of words which require careful definition. By ' tint ' M. Signac means the quality of a colour ; by ' tones ' the degree of luminosity or strength (saturation) of a tint. The gradation of one colour towards another creates a series of intermediary tints, and the gradation of one of these tints towards light or shade passes through a succession of tones. According to M. Signac, rhythm is " harmony of tint '—though the word usually has another significance in English—measure is ' harmony of tone,' corresponding to what English artists usually mean by ' values.'

Optical mixture denotes the fusing in the eye—at a reasonable distance—of touches of different colours placed side by side. A Divisionist painter desiring a grey does not mix two pigments on his palette and apply the mixture to his canvas, but places on his canvas little touches, say, of pure violet in juxtaposition to little touches of a yellowish-green. This speckle of green and violet, seen from a distance, will appear as a stretch of luminous grey. The optical toy, with a revolving disc of different colours which blend as the disc turns, is a more familiar example of the same phenomenon. The size of the touches must be in proportion to the size of the picture, tiny points for a small picture—hence ' pointillism '—oblong patches for a large decoration ; but the exact shape of the spot or patch is a matter of little importance. The vital matter is not the shape but the colour of the touch. The essential principle in Divisionism is the law of colour contrast, or the science of complementary colours. Building up a picture, like a mosaic, with little spots of pigment, instead of with sweeping brush-strokes, may give a vibrating, and therefore more lively surface, but it will not of itself ensure either luminosity, intensity of colour, or harmony. To secure these qualities brainwork, not manual dexterity, is required. The

founders of Neo-Impressionism evolved a system of colour-contrast which is of greater importance than any method of brush-work. They discovered that 'complementary colours 'which are friends and exalt one another in opposition, are 'enemies and mutually destructive when placed in optical 'conjunction.' M. Signac remarks that a red surface and a green surface opposed heighten one another, but 'green spots and red 'spots, placed in juxtaposition, produce a colourless and neutral 'effect.' The explanation is that the Divisionist painter must treat his spots of colour as light, not as pigment. Yellow, a primary colour in pigment, is a secondary colour in light being produced by the blending of green rays and red rays. But green spots and red spots give only a feeble effect of yellow and the painter obtains greater brilliance by using yellow pigment. The scientific contrast of colour, which is the base of Divisionism, must be used with common sense and a due regard to the limitations of paint.

'The shadow is always slightly tinted with the complementary 'colour of the light.' The truth of this first law of the Divisionists was instinctively recognised by Monet and his companions, but they never studied the subject from a scientific standpoint. The earlier men realised that shadows could not be truly rendered by neutral tints of brown or grey : in a green field in shadow they felt the presence of a complementary colour, and used sometimes a red, sometimes a violet, the last being a favourite hue much abused by ignorant imitators of the original Impressionists.

Where the Impressionist intuitively felt the presence of a complementary colour, the Neo-Impressionist reasoned it out. He investigated the precise tint of the green in order that he might scientifically reconstruct the exact tint of its complementary colour. There are infinite gradations of each colour. Every primary must incline more or less towards a secondary, every secondary must incline more or less towards a primary. A red must incline either towards orange or purple, a green must incline either towards blue or yellow. Most people have a hazy notion that the complementary of a primary is the secondary formed by the union of the two other primaries : thus they think of green as the complementary of red, violet as the complementary of yellow, and so on. Content with a rough perception of this,

the early Impressionists were lavish in using violet as a complementary in pictures flooded with yellow light. The Neo-Impressionist carried his investigations further. He asked himself whether the yellow light inclined towards orange or green. When looking at a field of grass he inquired what exactly was the tint of green in the lights, and according to the precise tint he constructed his complementary, a purplish-red for a yellow-green, an orange-red for a blue-green, a deeper orange-red for a deeper blue-green, and so *ad infinitum*.

The shadow is tinted with the complementary colour of the light, that is to say, an orange light has a blue shadow, and as the light grows redder with the advance of evening, so the shadows move from blue to green. The laws for pigments seem simple, but in nature the aspects are complicated, since local colours also react on one another, and reflections have to be taken into account.

This exhaustive enquiry into complementaries is the chief difference between the Impressionists and the Neo-Impressionists, both of whom used more or less the same palette, based on the seven colours of the solar spectrum ; but whereas the Impressionist freely mixed these colours, the Neo-Impressionist, desiring to keep his colour pure, was chary of mixing pigments. Mixture with white was freely allowed, and also the mixture of neighbouring spectral hues (*e.g.*, violet with a red or a blue, green with a blue or a yellow), so as to cover as far as possible the variety of the solar spectrum. The Neo-Impressionist obtained further varieties of tint by varying the proportion of the touches used to obtain an optical mixture.*

Painting according to the Neo-Impressionist formula became a highly complicated business during the last decade of the nineteenth century, but even the most enthusiastic Divisionist discovered there were limits beyond which his theories could not be put into practice. In a small landscape showing houses in

---

*The palette of the Neo-Impressionist naturally varied according to the views of the individual artist, but the general aim was to have pigments as near as possible to the colours of the rainbow. It may be of interest to give a specimen palette as set (from top to bottom) by a representative Divisionist :—white, cadmium yellow, vermilion, madder lake, cobalt violet, ultramarine, cobalt blue, emerald oxide of chromium, cadmium yellow, white.

the distance, the painter could divide the colour of the walls but he might find it impossible to divide the colour of details like the shutters on the windows. Opponents of the school promptly pointed out that it was illogical to divide the colour in one instance and not in the other.

The right reply to this criticism is that no method of painting is perfect. Neo-Impressionism is a convention like other methods; for the colour scale that any pigments can give is very remote from the colour scale of nature. Divisionism is dangerous as a master, but it is an excellent servant, and in common fairness it must be admitted that the Neo-Impressionists painted the colour of light and shadow with a truth and brilliance never before attained in the history of art.

It is essential to grasp the fact that Impressionism, with its later development, is the turning point of modern painting : it was the climax of the movement towards truth of appearance which, as Mr. Roger Fry admits, ' had been going on more or ' less steadily from the thirteenth century.' After this climax it was assumed, perhaps too hastily, that truth of representation had been pushed to a point where further development was impossible. Ambitious artists, cheated by their predecessors out of the joys of discovering foreshortening, perspective, and the true colour of shadows, abandoned altogether the pursuit of truth and sought after a new world of pictorial possibilities. Strangely enough they found a rallying point for the rebellion against realism in the paintings of the realist Cézanne.

Paul Cézanne (1839–1906) was numbered in his lifetime among the Impressionists, with whom he exhibited ; but to-day he is commonly regarded as the Father of Post-Impressionism. The unique position he holds between the older and younger schools is best explained by his own words :—' I wish to make of Im- ' pressionism something solid and durable like the art of the old ' masters.' Whereas most of his painter-comrades were pre-occupied with rendering fugitive effects of light, Cézanne was concerned with expressing in terms of colour the external verities of objects. When Cézanne paints a plate of apples we do not think at all of the light by which it is seen, but we receive a vigorous impression of the weight, density and solidity of the fruit. His art is simpler and less complicated than that of Monet and Pissarro ; his analysis of colour is more summary, his expression

ruder and more forcible. His palette was entirely his own and the prevalence of browns in his paintings would alone separate him from the other Impressionists. His pictures seem clumsy in handling compared with the delicate work of Renoir and Sisley, but by reason of his whole-hearted sincerity and honesty of purpose they make a stronger and deeper impression. His absorption in the act of painting, however, and his consequent detachment from life was such that he tended to paint human beings as if they were still-life. For all its fine qualities, we miss in his work the warm humanity of a Rembrandt.

This quality is present in the work of his younger contemporary, Vincent Van Gogh (1853–1890), who exclaims in one of his letters, ' I want to paint humanity, humanity, and again ' humanity.' A Dutchman by birth, Van Gogh was slow to find his true vocation, and he experienced life as a shop-assistant, a schoolmaster and a missionary, before he began painting in Paris in 1886 under the influence of Pissarro and Seurat. Though now described as a ' Post-Impressionist,' he adhered throughout his life to Neo-Impressionist ideals of painting, only instead of using spots and patches for the separation of colour, he juxtaposed fine lines of pigment. For this practice he had good authority, since Pissarro had already discovered that the grey shadows round the bottle-nose of Ghirlandaio's old man at the Louvre were built up of thin hair-lines of red and green paint. Van Gogh was not the inventor of a new technique, but he rapidly developed a distinctive style of his own, remarkable for its vehemence of attack, fierce strokes of paint being rained like blows on the canvas. He was the most passionate of painters, and the extraordinary intensity of his vivid impressions may be likened to our vision of things seen momentarily in the duration of a lightning flash. His colour is of a high order and pitch, showing a fine sensibility for the splendour of pigment, but he was too seriously absorbed in life and humanity for his paintings ever to degenerate into mere decorations. The fact that his mind eventually became unhinged, so that in his last years he produced pictures betraying an abnormal vision, does not invalidate the splendid sanity of the bulk of his productions, nor do certain experiments in other directions hinder us from ranking Van Gogh among the great realists of painting.

'When Gauguin was at Arles (he writes) I allowed myself to be led into working from imagination. But it is an enchanted land, and suddenly one finds oneself confronted with an insurmountable stone wall. . . . Maybe after a life spent in manly effort and endeavour and after a hard struggle shoulder to shoulder with nature, one might venture to try it; but for the present I shall not crack my brains over it, and I have slaved all the year round painting from nature.'

Paul Gauguin (1848–1903) also learnt painting from Camille Pissarro, whose style he copied closely in his earliest works. But Gauguin never was a realist; his romantic temperament found its ideal among the unspoilt barbarians of the Pacific. His mother was a Creole and he was born with a passion for the tropics. He soon broke away from the dogmas of the Neo-Impressionists, though his debt to them is confessed in the splendour of his colour—his magnificent yellows shine with the mellow glow of old stained glass. He made certain innovations, he deliberately simplified forms and re-introduced the fashion of binding them with rude dark outlines, but after admitting the technical interest and decorative merit of his work in Brittany, it remains doubtful whether Gauguin would have been so great a figure in modern art had he not sailed in 1891 to Tahiti. Thereafter his subjects had an intrinsic interest apart from his treatment of them, and his project of painting primitive folk in a primitive style made a wide appeal to the popular imagination. Like Stevenson, Gauguin was fascinated by the life and manners of the Kanakas. 'All the joys, animal and human, of a free life 'are mine,' he wrote enthusiastically after his arrival. 'I have 'escaped everything that is artificial, conventional, customary. 'I am entering into truth, into nature.' So Gauguin wrote, but he never entered into truth; he stepped into a land of dreams and his pictures remained a convention. When a literary friend in Paris quarrelled with his ideal, Gauguin replied:—'Your 'civilisation is your disease, my barbarism is my restoration to 'health.'

One can easily make out a case for regarding modern civilisation as a disease. There is a great deal in city-life that is repugnant to a thoughtful man, and the yearning for a simple life among artists had its parallel in the back-to-the-land movement in politics. 'If our life is diseased,' argued certain Paris artists, 'our art must be diseased also, and we can only restore art

' to health by starting it afresh like children or savages.' So began the reaction against the complexity of Neo-Impressionist painting, and this movement, influenced by the example of Gauguin, gave birth to the painters afterwards known as the *Fauves*.

The *Fauviste* movement may be regarded as an extreme emotional reaction against cold intellectual tendencies. Art is always swinging between emotion and intellectuality, and painters who preserve a just balance between the two are rare. The Impressionists and Neo-Impressionists were accused of being too scientific ; their works were said to be lacking in feeling. Since they had laid the accent on colour, the reactionaries laid stress on form and design, which they considered the Impressionists had neglected. The accusation was not altogether true, for without reference to the superb draughtsmanship of Degas, it is now admitted that Seurat was a most accomplished designer, while M. Paul Signac has proved his own attention to linear composition by brilliant work in black and white.

Nevertheless sympathy is not altogether to be denied to the perplexed artist of the twentieth century, for at the end of the nineties the art of painting had become rather like an overstuffed portmanteau in which nothing fresh can be put except by taking out something already there. The younger generation of painters who sought to make painting less complicated and simpler, moved in a right direction. A similar reaction in England, fifty years earlier, led Millais and Holman Hunt to go back to the painters before Raphael for qualities of line and colour which they thought desirable. The Paris painters, in their rage against civilisation, went further back. One by one all the old masters—except El Greco—were swept aside by revolutionaries who sought inspiration from the rudimentary art of savages and barbarians. Forcible, child-like scrawls began to appear in Paris exhibitions, paintings based not so much on any fresh view of nature as on the prehistoric art of Egypt, Turkestan, Polynesia and Central Africa.

The passion for simplicity and the desire to secure a maximum of expression with a minimum of means, which are the chief virtues of the *Fauviste* movement, are found in the highest degree in the work of M. Henri Matisse, the senior and leading exponent of this school. Though influenced by Gauguin, Matisse is in

no sense an imitator : he is a greater draughtsman than Gauguin, and though he has retained the high-keyed Impressionist palette of bright clean colours, he has abandoned the mosaic method of painting, using a sweeping brush and large planes of colour to fill in the masses of what are essentially linear designs. Many of his drawings are wonderful and masterly in their summary expression of form and movement ; no artist, not even Phil May, has expressed so much with so few lines ; but while admiring the extraordinary sureness and simplicity of his drawing, we are often bewildered by his wilful distortion of natural form. These perversities have been defended by M. Michel Puy who states that when Matisse exaggerates deformity he is led to it by a necessity of temperament which pushes him, whenever he sees a truth, to affirm it without discretion even to the point of paradox. It is difficult to believe that only passion for truth urges Matisse to present the calf of a leg as greater in circumference than its thigh, and there are no other qualities in his works which persuade us that sheer realism is his aim. On the other hand decorative intent is patent in all his pictures, and we frequently find distortions of form (as in ' La Toilette ') helping and emphasising the rhythm and equilibrium of the linear pattern. We are led to the conclusion, therefore, that these distortions are subjective and not objective in origin, and that Matisse wishes us to admire his paintings, not because the subjects are beautiful, not because his representation of them is true to nature, but because he has created a pattern of line and colour which should appeal to pure aesthetic sensibilities.

The rational simplicity of Matisse's earlier work has been developed with admirable results by M. Marquet and other painters ; his decorative forcefulness has stimulated the Dutchman, Kees Van Dongen, and through Van Dongen, Mr. J. D. Fergusson, Miss Anne Estelle Rice and other artists working in England : but the historical importance of Matisse is as the introducer of shock tactics into art and as a pioneer of the doctrine that actuality is unimportant to pictorial art.

Though put forward as the father of abstract painting, this doctrine was never professed by Cézanne. ' I wish to copy ' nature,' he said, ' I could not. But I was satisfied when I ' had discovered that the sun, for instance, could not be repro- ' duced, but that it must be represented by something else . . .

' by colour.' In his desire, however, to make objects look solid and enduring, Cézanne in some paintings sharpened curves into angles and emphasised cubic forms. His method of expressing the volumes of objects was perceived to be powerful and effective, and was seized upon by certain of the *Fauves*, who, desirous above all things of being forcible, elaborated their discovery into a dogma. Hence arose Cubism, a theory of painting based on two dogmatic assertions and a fallacious conclusion. These assertions were :—(1) ' strength is beauty '—it is not : nothing is more beautiful or weaker than a flower—(2) ' a straight line ' is stronger than a curved line '—it is not : every engineer knows that an arch is stronger than a horizontal on two perpendiculars. Blind to the error of their major and minor premise, the Cubists with a parade of logic proceeded to the conclusion that a painting wholly composed of straight lines is stronger and therefore more beautiful than a painting containing curved lines.

M. Metzinger's cubed portrait of a lady at the autumn Salon of 1910 and M. Braque's crystallisation of fields and meadows, failed to convince sceptics of the truth of the theory or of the virtue of the practice. All that was good in Cubism has been known since the time of Albrecht Dürer, who left among his drawings certain studies in ' squaring heads ' which are useful and interesting to the student as a glimpse of the workshop ; but Dürer would never have presented them to the public as complete and finished works of art.

Having cut up the human body into geometrical forms, the Cubists proceeded to create their next novelty by shuffling the pieces. The curious development, with which the name of the Spaniard Pablo Picasso is associated, professed to show, not merely one aspect of objects, but a number of sectional aspects seen from different standpoints and arbitrarily grouped together in one composition. An example of this method of picture-making is M. Picasso's ' Nature Morte : Verre et Pipe. 1919,' shown at the Leicester Galleries last January. In this we were shown bits of the outside, the inside and middle of the glass, bits of the inside and outside of the bowl and mouthpiece of the pipe, a sample of the tobacco—only, on the Irish principle of making the riddle harder, in the picture the tobacco is shown not in any section of the pipe but mixed up with pieces of glass—all arbitrarily grouped together in an order dictated solely by the fancy of the painter.

The complexity of a Neo-Impressionist painting was child's play in comparison with the entanglement of these puzzle-pictures, and though M. Picasso—whose art has passed through various phases—has produced a number of normal drawings and paintings of high merit, he has probably done more to unsettle artists than any living man. His sectional representation of divers aspects of different objects has been developed, with an added emphasis on the expression of movement, by the group of Italian painters known as the Futurists, and though there is strong evidence that Gino Severini developed his own style independently—as Segantini did of Monet—the majority of the futurists have been more or less influenced by Picasso.

As regards colour, the Futurists accepted the Divisionism and complementarism of the Neo-Impressionists, but in the rendering of form they sought to introduce new principles : ' universal ' dynamism must be rendered in painting as a dynamic sensa- ' tion ; movement and light destroy the materiality of bodies. ' With the pen of a skilled journalist (Signor Marinetti) at their disposal, they justified extraordinary practices by sonorous phrases, and a pictorial record of the observation that the seat of a chair is visible after the sitter has got up and walked away, was majestically alluded to as an example of ' the plastic inter- ' penetration of matter.' With superb assurance they endeavoured to convert painting from an art of space to an art of time, painting the world in a whirl as it might have appeared to the rider on Mr. Wells' Time Machine. Their daring experiments have produced few paintings likely to stand the test of time, though an exception may possibly be made for Signor Giacomo Balla's painting of centrifugal force, which, in addition to possessing decorative charm in its design and colour, is nobly expressive of the force that shoots meteorolites through the universe. An abstract painting that succeeds in expressing an abstract idea is clearly legitimate art, but no reference to Mr. Clive Bell's book on the subject is necessary to teach us that a painting without ' significant form ' is insignificant.

The kaleidoscopic paintings of the Italian Futurists were matched at Munich by the expressionism of the Russian, Wassily Kandinsky, who argued that painting, like music, should be able to give emotional pleasure without any appeal to association of material ideas. The contention is logical once we abandon

representation as an indispensable element in picture-making. But Kandinsky goes a step further, and claims that his abstract paintings are not mere dream-patterns but have a meaning for the initiated, in that they are based on the psychological effects on the observer of various lines and colours. These effects, however, are by no means definitely established, they are still a subject for speculation ; and till they are fixed by the common consent of mankind experiments in the ' art of spiritual har- ' mony ' will be uncertain and inconclusive. Indeed, in Kandinsky's own ' compositions,' as his abstract paintings are entitled, outward and visible signs alone give us a clue to their inward and spiritual meaning, and it is by discerning faint traces of a gun-carriage, a puff of smoke and falling houses in one of his pre-war compositions that we obtain a sense of that ' clash ' and conflict of ideals in the spiritual world ' that the painting is said to express.

British painting, protected by national conservatism, has been slow to be affected by continental art movements. Neo-Impressionism never gained many adherents on this side of the Channel, though one of the most exquisite of its exponents, Mr. Lucien Pissarro, has dwelt and worked among us for a quarter of a century. Mr. Walter Sickert freed himself from the influence of Whistler by contact with the French Impressionists, and retaining their mosaic method of painting (*le procédé par la tache*) but limiting his colour to the shimmering beauties of dim light, has achieved a unique and lasting position among the masters of *intimisme*. He and the eldest son of Camille Pissarro may be said to have had issue in the delicate and vibrating pictures of two artists recently deceased, Spencer Gore and Harold Gilman. Mr. Charles Ginner, often erroneously bracketed with Gore and Gilman as a ' pupil of Sickert,' owes nothing to that master. His distinctive style, which combines the fervour of a Van Gogh with the serene rectitude of a Crivelli, was already formed when he first came to England from Paris in 1910.

The reaction against Impressionism, which hardly any of our elder artists (except Mr. Clausen) troubled to adopt, may be traced in the figure paintings of Mr. Augustus John and in the landscapes of Mr. C. J. Holmes. Both show the same tendency towards simplification. But it was not till after the first Post-Impressionist exhibition at the Grafton Galleries in 1910 that

any considerable number of British artists were affected by the movements which had already agitated Paris.

The younger generation hastened to make up for lost time, and in a year or two London had painters as ' wild ' as any in Paris. But whereas the Frenchmen knew very well against what they were reacting, few of the English did, and in their ignorance they imitated the defects of painters whose excellences they did not understand. A French painter like M. Maurice Denis knows that ' it is puerile to glorify Cézanne for his negli- ' gences and imperfections,' though he also knows that notwith- standing them ' such is the power of his invention and the ' sincerity of his gesture that his ungainliness scarcely disturbs ' us and usually disappears in the general harmony.' The British imitators of Cézanne are certainly successful in reproducing the ungainliness : but they reveal no power of invention and we suspect the sincerity of their gesticulations.

Little is to be hoped for from the tame *Fauves* of Chelsea and Fitzroy Street, but there are grounds for believing good has come from another group, known before the war as the Vorticists. Vorticism as a creed needs no lengthy consideration : it was an ingenious British blend of Cubism, Futurism and Expressionism which obtained some publicity through the irrepressible energy of Mr. Wyndham Lewis. The early paintings and drawings by members of this group showed complete disregard for normal appearances, but they never were meaningless and often dis- played genuine inventiveness. Mr. Nevinson, who exhibited with the group though not a confessed Vorticist, gave a brilliant and vibrating impression of the sensations of a ' strap-hanger ' in a London tube : Mr. Wyndham Lewis in ' Plan of Campaign ' elaborated a diagram from a history-book into a decorative paint- ing, and in his drawing ' Enemy of the Stars ' he invented an inhuman creature and solved the problem of its balance. In 1913 and the early part of 1914 it was not easy to see where all this was leading, but it was clear that Mr. Lewis, together with Messrs. Bomberg, Roberts and Wadsworth, had constructed a new machinery for picture-making. The use to which this might be put was only revealed by the war.

According to Mr. Clutton Brock a belief has been growing upon us for fifty years or more that man is a machine and ' should ' be conscious of the fact that he is one.' Mr. Jacob Epstein

expressed his consciousness of the fact in his statue 'The Rock 'Drill,' but before August, 1914 the masses were not familiar with this belief and his sculpture was consequently not understood. If he had exhibited it a few years later with the title, 'The Prussian War God,' it would have been as popular and universally accepted as the war-paintings of Mr. Nevinson. Familiarity with the working of the war-machine prepared the mind of the public to accept that vision of the world as a complicated piece of mechanism which is the essence both of Cubism and Futurism. The men in Mr. Nevinson's early war-paintings and in Mr. Wyndham Lewis's drawings and paintings of the big guns at work, did not look like men as civilians see them, but they did express how soldiers felt about themselves. And the soldiers saw and understood.

The Vorticists, who before the war were merely exercising their inventive talents, now had offered to them one of the few subjects which their technique was fitted to express. For the Cubist method, as Mr. Clutton Brock has pointed out—

> 'does express, in the most direct way, the sense that in war man behaves like a machine or part of a machine, that war is a process in which man is not treated as a human being but as an item in a great instrument of destruction, in which he ceases to be a person and is lost in a process. The Cubist method, with its repetition and sharp distinction of planes, expresses this sense of a mechanical process better than any other way of representation.'

Since to view man as a mere machine is to have a wrong conception of life, it follows that any art based on this conception must be either satirical or perverse. The Cubist war-pictures by Messrs. Lewis, Nevinson, Roberts and others are all of them grim and terrible satires, and as such they have their value. But this method of painting cannot fruitfully be applied to any subject in which man is not regarded as part of a machine. Mr. Nevinson was perfectly right to abandon it when he exchanged the battle-fields of Flanders for the peaceful garden-parties of England. Mr. Edward Wadsworth was equally right to retain it in his impressions of the Black Country; for industrialism, like war, treats man as part of a great machine. Unless we are afflicted by another war, it is in industrialism, and in industrialism alone, that the Cubist will find his right material.

Since 1918 there has been a general return to realism, but the

experiments of the extremists are not valueless. They have widened the horizon of painting and opened the road to a new realism in which the firm structure and rigid design of the Cubists will be combined with a truth and beauty of colour derived from the Impressionists. But the wisest artists of all will be those who, like Mr. John Nash, follow the advice of Van Gogh and pay heed ' not so much to the teaching of painters as to the teaching ' of nature.' With the war the great opportunity of Cubism passed away, and the wonder is that this opportunity, missed by the French and Italian inventors of the method, was seized upon with conspicuous success by a handful of almost unknown British artists.

FRANK RUTTER.

THE CHANGING COUNTRYSIDE

Old and New in the Countryside. By Victoria de Bunsen. Longmans, Green. 1920.

WE are still too near the brink of the chasm which the war has hewn across the lives of men and nations, to be able to judge fairly the merits of the new ground on the other side. Things of the old order have passed away ; not only is the map of Europe changed, but the smallest everyday incidents have a new complexion. It is clear that the millennium has not descended on the countryside any more than on the industrial and political world. The point is how much of the old life has been retained to give hope for the future, and what seeds have been sown during the years of stress and turmoil, which in calmer times may yield a harvest of peaceful homes ? It is an all-important question, for, unless communistic socialism is the ideal to be aimed at, a healthy home life is the basis of society. The town cannot produce a permanently vigorous population, so the security of the nation is dependent on the well-being of its rural inhabitants. The cry of ' back to the land ' had been heard long before the war, but the desertion of the rural districts and the deadness of country life continued unabated. Are there any signs of returning animation ? And in the case of the countryside is it likely that any good can come out of the world-wide upheaval ?

In ' Old and New in the Country Side ' Mrs. de Bunsen touches with a tender hand some memories of her home thirty years ago, paints a vivid picture of the less pleasant features of life in and around the country town, and brings into strong relief the failings of those days, while some of its brighter aspects she ignores. In the last chapter she strikes a more gentle chord and bids a fond farewell to the passing of the old order, although in most of her pages she is quick to condemn ' stagnation ' and to welcome ' social reformers ' and ' social experiments ' of all kinds, and has little toleration for modest respectability and its humble pleasures. She sums up a vision of the past as ' the

' vested rights of the few, the dependence of the mass,' and of the future as ' a world where all things are overwhelmed in the ' rush and struggle for existence, material and moral, in the ' resistless impact of man, blind and led no longer, awake and ' determined, out to grasp and keep this time the things so long ' denied him.' Is there no ray of light, I would ask ? Is the outlook so black ? Is this spirit of resentment and Bolshevism the only one which the soil of Devon or the weald of Kent can produce ? Or is there any brighter prospect for the future ?

The book is a sketch of country life during years of rapid change and of the deepest depression. Farmers and land owners were experiencing great financial losses ; the price of wheat was constantly falling. Hundreds of thousands of acres went out of cultivation, fewer hands were employed, and wages went down lower and lower. Bad seasons and sinking prices hit everyone engaged in agriculture. But, after all, those forty years between 1874 and 1914 are only like one small step on a very long ladder. England—the England of hawthorn and poppies, of thrushes' songs and brown trout streams, of buttercup meadows and hedgerow elms—did not grow in a day, and there have been periods of depression before. There are signs now on every side that another phase of rural life, far removed from the dull, precarious one of the eighties, is dawning, and amid much unrest there are indications that a new and brighter era is beginning.

The life of ' the family ' living in ' the Hall ' forty years ago and the village world centred round them, with all the inherited interest on either side, can hardly be entered into by the ' week-ender ' or the town dweller who has settled down in the country to be near good golf links. There was something subtle in the way the centuries had twined the lives of those in the remote countryside together. It was not by any means always the condescension of a landlord or lady-bountiful, on the one hand, nor poverty and slavish dependence on the other ; there was frequently a genuine affection and respect, a sense of responsibility on the one part and appreciation on the other. Feelings which grew up through so many hundreds of years with oak, ash and thorn on English soil, and only faded gradually as changes made the old relations impossible, cannot vanish without leaving their traces on the character of the nation.

In picturing existence during the winter months in her home Mrs. de Bunsen recalls the almost daily excursions of the children with a basket of food from their own table, but she stops there, and does not continue the sketch to their entrance into the cottage, which might have given a more pleasing tone to the scene. The resident would probably welcome the party warmly, for had she not been nursery maid in their grandfather's nursery? And had she not often 'heard tell' what a fine young lady their great grandmother had been when she first came from 'down in 'the shires'; and could she not discover one of the party to be 'the living image' of some relative who must have worn sprigged muslin and sandal shoes? Not unfrequently before the end of the visit home-made wine is produced, and the politeness of the small guests is strained to the utmost in concealing their reluctance to partake of the unaccustomed beverage. There was nothing servile or patronising on either side, and such a visit called forth genuine sympathy and left a kindly feeling behind it.

If an antiquarian had been present, those springs of mutual cordiality might have been traced far further into the past. It might be that the muddy lane down which the children picked their way had always been known by the name of some one so long ago forgotten that, although nobody living in the parish had borne it for centuries, no one questioned why; but the old title deeds recorded how the bearer of it gave away a rood of land adjoining that lane in the reign of Henry VI, and the recipient of that rood had the same name as the respected family who had supplied nursery maids for generations. The Manor House was probably only built in the time of the seventh Henry, so after all both squire and labourer inherited the same attachment to the soil. The lane was unmetalled only because that part of the village had never recovered its prosperity since the Black Death. After that scourge the smaller church had fallen into disrepair, and the cottages that clustered round it had crumbled away. Perhaps no event beyond varying seasons and changing owners had ever touched that rood of land since the original owner parted with it, until a bomb dropped by a passing Zeppelin tore a great hole in its surface. On Sussex Downs and Wessex heaths, on Yorkshire Wolds and East Anglian fens, wherever neither coal nor iron have transformed the face of the earth, traces of the old world still obtrude themselves into the present, and, although

unrest to-day is pressing on the rural districts, there are roots so deeply embedded in the past that the new growth bids fair to retain some of its salient features. It is up to those who wish for the typical ' Merry England ' to see that the bad is pruned away, and only the best—the self-reliance, the sense of responsibility and the kindliness—is retained.

The old feelings were often strengthened during the war. Look at the record of service in some of the villages, the enormous proportion of able-bodied men who ' joined up ' at the first call of their country. It was not entirely due to patriotism, but there were some ready, as in feudal times, to follow the owner of the soil to battle. How often news that the squire's soldier son had fallen in those early days of 1914 stirred the young men at once to enlist ! If the playing fields of Eton have been responsible for many of our generals, the cricket of the village green has had its share in the characters of our non-commissioned officers. New links have been forged in France, Gallipoli and Mesopotamia. Those who have been planning settlements for disabled ex-service men do wisely when they aim at providing good cottages and suitable occupations near their old homes. This is being done with marked success at Shrivenham in Berkshire. The old associations under improved conditions are inducing men to return and settle near their native villages.

Long before the eighties of last century the forward steps had begun to lead further from the past. Some would date the greatest changes to the advent of railways or the penny post. One shrewd old lady looking back considered that the inventions of matches and of photography had changed the lives of poor country folk more than anything she could recall. In these days of quick communication and cheap press it is hard to realize the remoteness of the countryside a century ago. The son who went to seek his fortune was probably not heard of for years. There was no such thing as forty-eight hours' leave in the Napoleonic wars ! Migration from even one county to another was rare, and the local market town was as a rule the most distant point on the horizon.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the rural parish in England was a self-contained unit ; it discharged its duties to the Lord of the Manor, it accumulated property and funds of its own, it built and maintained its parish church, its charities were

administered by duly elected churchwardens, it had its rights to common lands and its cattle, its coffers were replenished by generous gifts, it maintained its almshouses and supported its poor. Often it had an annual fair or some local industry. No doubt its cattle were sometimes raided, and the greed of its overlord or the waves of civil war disturbed its peace, but for all that, there existed a well-ordered, self-contained, social community. If the village is again to become a living force, something of this old self-centred spirit must be kept alive.

The hereditary owners of the soil are passing away, and thousands of estates have changed hands since the war. The rates and taxes on land are now so heavy, that in some districts where the soil is very poor, it actually pays to give away land rather than pay the charges on it. There are no figures available as yet recording the total amount of agricultural land which has passed into the market during recent years, but some idea of the quantity can be gathered from the fact that one leading firm of auctioneers alone have sold an average of half a million acres a year for the last four years. Of these they estimate roughly that one-quarter to one-third were purchased by the tenants. For the most part the new possessors of the larger estates have none of the old associations or ties, and are free from all feelings of inherited responsibility. But the village community has not changed, and it owes no allegiance to the new-comers. It wants social life and amusements more than ever, so the tendency is to make its own plans, and no longer to wait for ' the Hall ' or the parson to direct or preside. The labourers themselves, with the small farmer, the carpenter who won a military cross, the postman's son who came home a sergeant with three wound stripes, or such-like, naturally take the lead, and cricket matches and flower shows in summer, whist drives and socials in winter, are organized by the villagers themselves. The war broke down some of the narrow social distinctions. Work parties for the local hospital or county regiment, Voluntary Aid Detachments in which all took a share, brought ' church ' and ' chapel ' folk together more effectively than the Primrose League, so much ridiculed by Mrs. de Bunsen.

It is a species of madness to think that an army of inspectors from Whitehall could come into any given county and ' set to ' rights ' real or imagined grievances. The villagers are conscious

of some of their needs, and will not refuse a helping hand, so long as it is not held out in a patronizing or domineering way, but they must work out their own salvation, and each locality will do so in its own way. To replace the dependence on the lord of the manor by dependence on 'the Government,' which in some quarters is looked upon like a quack medicine warranted to cure every ill, would never bring back the spirit of neighbourliness, of co-operation and local pride. There are doubtless many matters for reformers to take in hand—better housing, improved water supplies—to make the housewifely drudgery less irksome, methods of relief and so on, but the pace of change should not be forced. The system by which the recipient of relief is not allowed in any way to help himself is a sad feature in the life of a hard-working labourer. A man 'on his club' has to sit idly by his fireside all day long or wander aimlessly about, whereas he would probably recover more quickly and would certainly be happier if he might do a little light work to pass the time. An hour setting potatoes in his own allotment would be very different from a long day's work with the plough or in the stack yard, yet for fear of malingering he is debarred from this solace. The view that a disabled ex-service man can supplement his pension by any occupation suited to his capacity is a much more broad-minded and reasonable line to take.

No wonder there is a great difference of outlook from a village now to what there was before the war. Forty years ago there were still old people in out-of-the-way places who had never been in a train. They had no knowledge of other conditions: they usually were not dissatisfied simply because they could not visualise anything different. To-day all the able-bodied men who served in the war have come home with their eyes opened and their minds enlarged. The men thus enlightened must leaven the whole community. In one Dorset village (Shillingstone) out of a population of 565 there were 88 voluntary enlistments, and the number who actually served was 11 officers and 140 men. In some small hamlets the percentage has been even higher. Nor is it only those who fought who look on life with a changed aspect; the farmer and the labourer who had to stay at home found out the value the nation set on them. The spectre of famine made eyes which never before had noticed whether corn or cabbages were grown, turn to the land, and the owner of a

fruitful field or even of a 10-rod allotment suddenly felt himself of importance.

Things are by no means easy for the small farmer at the present time. To cultivate the land ploughed up at the nation's call in 1917–18 was possible so long as the price of wheat was high, but arable land is more costly to farm, and already the profits are swallowed up in the high wages required by law, and, but for the price guaranteed by Government, there would already have been an actual loss. Agricultural labourers are often spoken of as if all were alike, but any one with experience knows the great difference between the skilled and unskilled. The man who understands stock, who can do good thatching and hedging, who quickly sets a field for ploughing straight and even, and who gets through twice as much work in a day, is surely worth more than the one who slowly plods through the hours. Yet there is little difference in remuneration. Wages Boards, unless carefully handled, may easily have the same deadening influence as the socialist maxim of ' Thou shalt not excel ' for fear of becoming more prosperous than your neighbour. The restriction of hours of work in the summer makes the good worker even more valuable than before. Many farmers felt that, at the busiest time last summer, when the statutory week was fifty hours, as compared with fifty-four of the previous year, it was hardly possible, even in fine weather, for any except the very best men to give work really worth the minimum wage. The improvement in cottages, so much needed in many districts, will continue to be slow so long as an economic rent is not paid, and only 3s. a week can be allowed in wages in consideration of the advantage of having a cottage rent free.

The significance, which the war brought home in a realistic way, of being dependent on production overseas for four-fifths of our wheat, is apt to be only too quickly forgotten, and it would indeed be disastrous if the efforts made to increase home production permanently were in vain. This generation looked on some of the land ploughed up in 1917 as virgin forest, so wild and overgrown had it become ; but this was far from being the case. I was astonished when some waste heath in Dorset was ploughed, as I thought, for the first time in history, to find old people who remembered heavy crops of wheat being reaped there only fifty years ago. Already the amount of arable land

in the country is again declining. It had been steadily going down for some years, and the acreage under the plough in 1914 was the lowest on record, 10,998,000 acres. The highest reached in 1918 was 12,399,000 acres, but during the last two years the total area under arable cultivation has been diminishing ; last year the decrease amounted to 289,000 acres, but in spite of this the net gain in corn crops generally is nearly 700,000 since 1914. The Ministry of Agriculture returns for cattle, sheep and horses are also depressing, and all live stock seems to have declined except pigs. On the other hand the number of small-holders has increased, particularly those occupying from five to fifty acres. Among the new small-holders some of the ex-service men who have settled on the land may be counted. The return shows that (in round numbers) over 48,000 applied for holdings ; of these nearly 12,000 were considered unsuitable ; some 16,000 of those approved are not yet allotted land, but 11,656 have actually been provided with holdings since 1918, totalling 165,820 acres or an average of just under 14¼ acres per head.

The Food Production Department of the Ministry of Agriculture was not only busy with the ploughing up of untilled soil during those strenuous years, but other movements likely to produce food were encouraged. Naturally cottage gardens and allotments came in for a large share of attention, and much of the organisation started then to improve cultural methods is being carried on. The effect of the provision of allotments in towns by commandeering parts of open spaces and utilizing undeveloped building sites has been to give town dwellers a thirst for gardening, which in some cases it is difficult to continue to satisfy. A portion of the ' accommodation land ' taken with the assistance of D.O.R.A. has had to revert to other uses, so the number of allotments in the country has decreased since the peace, the loss being almost entirely in the urban districts ; but in spite of this the total is still about three-quarters of a million greater than before the war. The desire for knowledge by the allotment holders in manufacturing and mining districts was remarkable, and, having no preconceived notions of gardening, they proved receptive pupils. It was harder to instil new ideas in the completely rural districts, but the local horticultural representatives of the Food Production Department, of whom there were nearly a thousand, and other voluntary helpers, numbering

some 1,500 gardeners, did good service to horticulture by lecturing, overseeing and advising allotment holders, and encouraging them to form Co-operative Societies for the purchase of seeds and tools, and the disposal of surplus. Some of these grew into considerable marketing centres. Jam factories were supplied, and fruit pulping absorbed fruit which would otherwise have been wasted. In 1917 there were several stations where from ten to sixty tons of plums were pulped a week, and, although some of these centres were breweries only temporarily altered, others have passed into private hands, and carry on pulping in good fruit seasons. The collection of blackberries for jam, organised for the first time in the same year in six counties, was carried out all over England in 1918; the greatest quantity gathered through the schools alone in Gloucestershire amounted to 313 tons. A campaign against potato disease was set in operation, and the advantage of spraying inculcated, and fruit bottling and canning by simple processes were widely taught.

Such enterprises woke up many a sleepy countryside, and, once convinced that both pleasure and gain were to be got out of these and similar ventures, the people have been willing to continue them without Government assistance. Old methods of cultivation are, however, very tenaciously clung to. Some of the traditional rules that are adhered to all over England are harmless, as, for instance, the planting of potatoes on Good Friday; but others, such as the habit of exchanging seed potatoes within a small radius, is fatal to good crops. I know from personal experience how difficult it is to combat such prejudices. I fear that even in the face of a diseased plot in a southern county I failed to convince the holder that he would have had a far heavier and probably a healthy crop had he procured seed from the north or the east of England. 'He's been good enough this twelve 'years, I got 'un from over there' was his final remark, as he pointed across the valley. But, in spite of reluctance to admit that new methods are improvements, cultivation is better, especially where collections for a local market have been attempted. The higher price which well graded produce fetches, and the rejection of inferior goods, has successfully demonstrated the advantages of scientific horticulture. Since March, 1920, the horticultural representatives have been disbanded, as the work of the Horticultural Sub-Committees of the Agricultural Executive

Committees is now transferred to the County Education Authorities, which have their whole-time skilled instructors, but six County Authorities have retained the services of the men who carried on during the war.

Education has often been blamed for the depletion of the rural districts, and there were some of the old school who would even denounce it, as if the Act of 1870 had been the cause of the agricultural depression which happened to follow it. No doubt teaching has not always been of the most suitable kind, and it is to be hoped that the framers of the school curriculum will aim at an education which quickens interest in outdoor pursuits, awakens the mind to the beauties and possibilities of intelligent country life, and discourages the idea, so often preached by narrow-minded, town-bred teachers, that the fuller life can only be reached amid smoke-dimmed, noisy streets. Many a schoolmaster felt himself banished from the world in a remote village ; the great opportunity of leadership it opened out never occurred to him, and he firmly believed that the ' sharp lad ' must necessarily be advised to migrate to a town as soon as he had ' passed his ' standards.'

At the beginning of this century efforts in the direction of promoting nature-study were made by various voluntary bodies, coincident with the wave of morris-dancing and the revival of folk-songs. A few school gardens were embarked on, and in 1910 the Board of Education issued a circular encouraging the further teaching of gardening, and pointing out the educational value it affords by giving a practical reality to some of the class subjects. In spite of these efforts the number of school gardens increased but slowly, but by 1914 there were altogether some 3,200 in England and Wales. The pressure of the necessity for more food had a wholesome effect, and in many cases land which could not have been obtained for the purpose before was acquired by school authorities. An appeal to them in 1917 led to an instant response, and a thousand were soon added. One county (Durham) showed an increase of forty acres, and by 1919 there were over 5,000 school gardens. There has been no difficulty in maintaining these, but, now that the compelling force is no longer there, they are not coming on as fast as they might, and as yet only about a third of the country schools have gardens. In some areas the percentage is laudably high, notably in East Suffolk,

where it is 77 per cent., and in Surrey, where it is 64 per cent. When so much depends on awakening interest in country callings, if the youth of the villages is to be deterred from flocking to the towns, school gardens have an important part to play. Petty local difficulties should be overcome until every country elementary school has its garden.

The desire for a better education in rural occupations is not confined to the elementary schools, but extends right up to the University. A most commendable solicitude for knowledge in scientific management of an estate is shown by many young landowners. A man who has studied rural economy at a University is likely to be wise in administration and helpful to tenants and labourers alike. Farming on sound economic principles is not only indispensable if the tenure of large estates is to be financially possible, but it is essential to national wealth.

How many people forty years ago suffered disappointment in their endeavours to start village clubs and reading rooms, and how discouraging it was to see numbers dwindling, the papers unread, even the draughtsmen and dominoes laid aside ! The spontaneous movement now coming from the men themselves and not from would-be benefactors has a very different complexion. It has been wisely backed up by the Village Clubs Association, which now has over 300 clubs under its aegis, extending over forty-two counties in England and Wales. The first necessity is to possess a hall, and the expense of obtaining this is one of the chief obstacles to be overcome. In some cases army huts have been purchased, and, although these cannot last permanently, they can carry a club along for a few years, during which time, by means of performances and entertainments given in them, a fund for a more suitable building can be formed. It seems unfortunate when the demand is so extensive that, although many army huts are said to be still available, there appear to be great difficulties in the way of direct purchase.

Some of these clubs are very progressive, and the promoters, in many cases labourers and ex-service men, have achieved astounding results. One of the most forward has been in a small Bedfordshire village, Woburn Sands, where with no outstandingly rich people to bear a large proportion of cost, the club bought two army huts, and the members erected them, bought a second-hand plant for electric light and installed it themselves, purchased

enough land to lay out two tennis courts and a bowling green and a little garden in which to have tea in the summer. Tennis is quite an innovation as a village game, but it is good to see the revival of bowls for the older members, as for many centuries, long before the advent of cricket, it was a prime favourite. Most of the clubs have concentrated on activities such as dramatic societies, lectures, concerts, or study circles. The demand for libraries is growing, and in some counties where the Education authorities have availed themselves of their powers under the Public Libraries Act of 1919 much has been done, and help can be obtained from the Carnegie Trust, but unfortunately this does not apply in all the places where there is a demand. In one Worcestershire village, the club rooms are open on Sunday afternoons in winter for the exchange of books and ideas, supplemented by music. The friendly intercourse engendered has been welcomed by ministers of all denominations in the neighbourhood.

The desire for a fuller life and better conditions is felt by the women as acutely as by the men. In many clubs there are evenings when the women folk are invited, but the Women's Institutes are the result of an independent movement. It is directed from a headquarters in London, and has received the stimulus of a Government grant for the initial propaganda, but the growth is spontaneous. The prosperity of a few institutes started in Wales led to the idea of developing them by the Food Production Department in 1917. The spread, slow at first, has accelerated so wonderfully that, whereas in January, 1920, there were just under 1,400 institutes, there are about 2,000 at the present time, and every English county (except Middlesex) has its Federation, which means at least fifteen institutes. Usually there are many more ; Hampshire with 120 holds the record for the moment. The total number of members subscribing 2s. annually is over a hundred and twenty thousand, and each institute is self-supporting. Occasionally the president is the wife of one of the larger landowners, but most of the institutes are imbued with a spirit of independence ; the meetings, classes, and industries are as a rule arranged by the farmers' and labourers' wives, and just now their enthusiasm is unbounded. Perhaps this is most remarkable in the Yorkshire dales, where farmers' wives have walked eight miles through the snow to attend the monthly meetings.

The social vitality which has been awakened in the dull lives of many labourers' wives seems unlikely to be transient, as the source of motive power is in themselves. They come to classes on their own initiative, and not simply to please the squire or parson's wife. Their handicrafts, so far, do not compete in the open market, but rather supplement the comfort of the home, and no more has been produced than can be disposed of locally. Glove making, fur craft, basket making, caning chairs, raffia and rush work are the principal diversions, and a certain number of soft toys are made. The institutes are linked together by federation, and are in close touch with the County Agricultural and Education Authorities, and so far they have succeeded in keeping entirely undenominational and non-party. The boy scouts as well as the girl guides are other very potent factors in the countryside to-day. The training which the youth is thus receiving is a strong guarantee for the future continuance of the clubs and institutes. The whole teaching and discipline is fitting boys and girls to carry on the enterprises set on foot by their elders.

So many bodies are at work that there seems some danger of overlapping, and consequent waste of energy. A little rivalry is all to the good, and the achievements of one society or club whet the ambition of the others. All kinds of ideas are fertilizing in the brains of some of the local leaders. Bold suggestions such as swimming baths or the use of water power for electric light have been thrown out. What a contrast to the hamlet of the ' good old days,' with ' tallow dip,' dark lanes, and only the public house for social gatherings, a prosperous village of the future might present. Unless the flames of latent unrest are fanned by disruptive and destructive socialistic forces, there is no reason why the present forward movement should not continue to develop on sound progressive lines. If only the intellectual training is such as to enhance the dignity of manual toil, and if an intelligent interest in work can relieve the monotony of labour, with the increased leisure and the new advantages for satisfying the craving for learning and amusement, the lot of an agricultural labourer might indeed compare favourably with that of a town artisan. Add to this the ever varying charms of seed time and harvest, snowy blossoms and russet falling leaves, and those common things, the sun, the air, the showers, which unbidden beautify the lives of dwellers in the country, it were easy to paint a picture of the future alluring and full of promise.

Alicia M. Cecil.

ASCLEPIADES OF SAMOS

1. Poeti Alessandrini. By A. Rostagni. Torino. 1916.
2. Epigramm und Skolion. By A. Reitzenstein. Giessen. 1903.
3. Anthologia Palatina. Paris : Didot. 1887.

FAME and fortune are fickle and uncertain goddesses : never more so than when they are dealing with the poets who are their most fervent votaries. Every poet prays for immortality; but even those who achieve a certain measure of their desire have often failed to gain that full share of renown which their work seems to deserve. Some are men of so personal a genius that they never found a school, and standing by themselves are often for generations, by the caprice of fashion, neglected. Others suffer from the reverse fortune. They are chosen as patterns by their successors who, adding new beauties of their own, obscure the lustre of the original model, and take to themselves all the glory that should be his. Such has been the fate of Asclepiades. Although he is acclaimed as master by Theocritus and although he is the first inspirer of Horace, he is now, even to lovers of Greek and Roman poetry, little more than a name, and were it not for the few epigrams that Meleager preserved in the Anthology, his works would have altogether perished.

And yet he was one of the most brilliant figures of his time—the period before Theocritus and Callimachus—courtier, student, poet, wit ; the most finished artist of all the Alexandrian school. An epigram by Asclepiades, as Croiset says, is like some polished bronze, lovingly chiselled by a craftsman's hand, and better than any other he combines the graceful simplicity of classical poetry with that new fervour of amatory enthusiasm which is the great discovery of Alexandrian literature. He scarcely achieves the true note of sincerity in love : that is reserved for Meleager : but at least he points out the road.

Ever since the year 4004 B.C. the relations between the sexes have been one of the chief themes of literature. Early Greek

poetry is no exception to this rule and both the Iliad and the Odyssey have a strong feminine interest. But in the course of the sixth century there came a change, and among the Greeks of the great age, especially at Athens, for reasons which it is not necessary here to discuss, romantic love between men and women, and consequently any expression of that love in literature, can scarcely be said to have existed. Euripides and Plato both did their best to raise the level of sentiment, but they and their followers were only an insignificant minority and so long as the old close system of the Greek City States remained there was little chance of improvement.

Alexander in this, as in many ways, begins a new era. The spirit of freedom and adventure that his conquests brought into the Greek world had a direct result on the position of women. In the greatest of the cities that he founded, women from the first emerged from their state of semi-slavery and demanded and received from men the respect and consideration which is their due. Even as Olympias in Macedonia had been able to hold her own against Philip, so the women of the reigning family of the Ptolemies, women like Berenice, Arsinoë, and Cleopatra, were at least as competent and vigorous as their men, and the influence they exercised in affairs of State is reflected in the literature which the royal house did so much to foster. For the first time writers began to make the pleasure of their readers, and especially their female readers, their main object: verses were composed in woman's honour, and love poetry as we know it gradually came into existence.

Of this love poetry the epigrams of Asclepiades are now practically in order of time our first examples. He had, it is true, some models in the past: the shadowy Mimnermus in the seventh century who wrote elegies in honour of his mistress, the flute girl Nanno, and the learned Antimachus, so greatly admired by Plato, who composed a long and tedious poem for his beloved Lyde, a poem imitated by Philetas and frequently referred to by all the Alexandrians. But such fragments of Mimnermus and Antimachus as remain do not suggest any great warmth of affection. They seem rather the frigid exercises of scholars than the real expression of emotion, and their chief value to Asclepiades was probably that they supplied him in the elegiac couplet with a convenient model for his verse.

Moreover even in this respect Asclepiades was not content with being merely a follower of other poets. He wrote frequently in elegiacs, but in accordance with the constant tendency of Greek art he also invented for himself a new literary form to correspond with his new subject. In the lyrics of Sappho and Alcæus, and in the choral poetry of the great Athenian dramatists, he found a pattern which he could adapt for his purpose. When Aeschylus in a chorus treats of marriage or of women's affection, he changes his music to the glyconic rhythm of the marriage song—Hymen O Hymenae' Hymen,—and this particular combination of syllables, a spondee followed by a choriambus and then by an iambus, aroused naturally in the Greek mind ideas of happy love and marital felicity. From this basis Asclepiades developed the Asclepiad measure that still bears his name, making lines of different length by the use of one, two, or three choriambi and introducing further variety by the frequent use of catalexis.

It is from him that Horace borrowed the metre of many of the most successful Horatian odes, the ' Quis multa gracilis,' the ' Tu ne quaesieris,' the ' Pastor cum traheret.' How far Horace was indebted to the Alexandrian poet for his thought as well as his rhythm we cannot now tell, for it is part of Asclepiades' bad fortune that none of his poems in this, his own particular form, have come down to us. But in many of the Odes it is fairly obvious that Horace is translating closely from the Greek, and in his asclepiads at least it is only reasonable to suppose that the Greek is Asclepiades. Indeed for all Horace's skill it is difficult not to feel a sort of resentment against him, for here, as often, it would seem that the popularity of the Latin adaptation proved fatal to the Greek original and that it was the bright colours of Horace's tulips that made men neglect the anemones of Asclepiades with their more modest grace.

In outward form then, as in subject matter, Asclepiades is a true inventor. And he is also, apparently, responsible for a conception that was destined to enjoy a long vogue both in poetry and painting. In his poems for the first time we find the new idea of Love as a winged child playing on his mother's breast ; Love, as our poet says, not yet cruel nor carrying a bow, but a tiny boy lisping love charms from a golden tablet in the Cyprian's arms. So it is that the little god himself speaks in the pretty

lines addressed to the constant Damis.

'A Cupid small, an easy prey,
From mother's arms I flew away:
And now to Damis have I come
Never again from her to roam,
For loved and loving, free from care,
With one alone her heart I share.'

Anthologia Palatina, Book xii. 105.

To the Athenians Eros was the slim adolescent embodied in the statues of Praxiteles and Lysippus, such a figure as Asclepiades himself remembers when he writes to a youth—'If thou wert 'to grow golden wings above and on thy silvery shoulders 'were slung a quiver full of arrows, Cypris herself would not 'know which is her son.' And it is of the Athenian ideal he thinks, when he celebrates the beauty of the two friends—

'Beauty with beauty mingled see;
For Love has brought Cleander's flower
Eubiotus his mate to be
In sweet Persuasion's bower.

Black ebony with ivory blent
Will never seem so fair as they,
Nor gold with emerald besprent
An equal bloom display.'

A.P. xii. 163.

It cannot be denied that this Eros has a certain charm. But he is a sterile and perverse divinity, and Asclepiades rendered a real service both to art and morals when he invented a new shape for the god to correspond with the new idea of Love. Aphrodite, the woman and the mother, now takes the first place: the baby Cupids play about her knee in happy dependence. The conception lends itself in weak hands to a sentimental frivolity and could be easily debased to the childish prettiness of the Pompeian frescoes; but it represents a very distinct advance in moral standard and had no small influence on the later development of romance.

References to Asclepiades, the man and his poems, among the gossip collectors of a later age, Ælian, Plutarch, Lucian, are comparatively rare. But, thanks chiefly to Athenaeus, we have a fair amount of knowledge of the Samian school of literature of which he was the most distinguished member. The overthrow of the Greek City States by Philip of Macedonia on the

field of Chaeronea in 338 B.C. had results in literature as well as in politics. Athens, it is true, still survived as a literary centre and Menander and Theophrastus carried on there—with a difference—the traditions of Euripides and Aristotle. But all living virtue was gone, and now again, as in the seventh and sixth centuries, it was in places outside Greece itself that Greek literature found its real home. In Sicily, in South Italy, among the islands of the Aegean, fresh schools of writers arose and for a few decades at least, before they were attracted and submerged in the new foundations at Alexandria, they maintained a vigorous local life. It was in the islands, in Sicily, Cos, Samos and Rhodes, rather than at Alexandria itself that nearly all the best Alexandrian poetry was produced. The great city attracted writers but it did not breed them, and of all these nests of poets Samos was perhaps the most important.

In Samos about the year 300 B.C. literature had the advantage, such as it is, of State patronage of a rather special kind. The type of ruler who encourages art for political reasons, a Pisistratus or Augustus, was always fairly common in ancient times, but in Douris who became tyrant of Samos in 301 B.C. writers found not only a patron but a fellow craftsman. Like his contemporary Demetrius of Phalerum, who ruled Athens for ten years from 300 B.C. to 290 B.C. Douris began life as a student of literature, and then, by one of those turns of fortune so common in that age of transition, found himself upon the throne of his native land. His historical studies, which had included a life of Agathocles, were doubtless of some assistance to him in his new position, and his brother Lynceus, who was both a writer of comedies and also a great authority on gastronomy, maintained the family tradition of *belles lettres*. Other authors were soon attracted. Aethlius compiled the local records of Samos, Posidippus came from Cnidos, Hedylus with his mother Hedyle from Athens. Nicaenetus left Abdera in Thrace and devoted himself to the task of commemorating in verse the chief episodes in the history of his new country. Aeschrion the iambic poet, Philaenis authoress of ' The Pleasures of Love,' and Phalaecus, who gave his name to the hendecasyllabic metre in which Catullus, and Martial afterwards, found their best medium for intimate verse, were all members of the circle that acknowledged Asclepiades as its leader.

All these writers, whether their medium was prose or verse, had one characteristic in common, which they passed on to Alexandrian literature. They were realists; in history preferring the personal anecdote to political theory, in philosophy dealing with rules of conduct rather than with metaphysical speculations, in poetry avoiding any flight of imagination and describing familiar incidents of every-day life. With two of their number, Hedylus and Posidippus, Asclepiades was clearly on terms of close intimacy. The three poets are linked together by Meleager in one couplet of his Proem—' the wild field flowers ' of Hedylus and Posidippus, together with the wind blossoms ' of Sikelidas '—Sikelidas being the name by which for some unknown reason Asclepiades is often called. It is highly probable that the ' Soros ' or ' Garner,' of which a scholiast on Homer speaks, was a selection of their verse written in collaboration and published jointly by the three, such a volume as the ' Lyrical ' Ballads ' or the ' Poems by Three Brothers ' in our own literature. Doubtless it was from the ' Garner ' that Meleager took those pieces which are in the MS. of the Anthology attributed to Asclepiades *or* Hedylus, Asclepiades *or* Posidippus, and it is possible still to get some indication of the book's contents and of the authors' methods of composition.

Many of the epigrams seem to have been written in friendly rivalry over the wine cups on some theme suggested at a meeting of the poets' club. We have, for example, versions by Asclepiades and Hedylus of the themes ' Drink and be Merry,' ' Wine and a toast '; by Asclepiades and Posidippus of the themes ' A Seaside Grave,' ' Love mortal and divine,' ' Cupid ' and his toys,' ' Antimachus and the Lyde,' ' Philaenis.' Other poems again may have formed in the ' Garner ' parts of a series. There was probably a series of epitaphs for the tombs of dead courtesans, in which Posidippus writes on Doricha, Sappho's famous rival, and Asclepiades gives us the beautiful lines on Archeanassa, the fair light o' love whose charms were said to have captivated even Plato's heart.

> ' When came the first faint lines upon her face
> Love resting softly gave them beauty's grace.
> Oh lovers, ye who knew her youthful bloom
> Through what a fiery furnace have you come.'
>
> A.P. vii. 217.

To another series, epitaphs on dead heroes and poets, probably belongs the well-known epigram by Asclepiades on Ajax, picturing the warrior's grave on the Rhoetean shore ' where Virtue with ' shorn locks bewails the triumph of cunning Fraud,' a poem which in the Anthology is followed by no less than seven variations on this same theme dating from Antipater of Sidon to Leontius. And with it we may place his ' Lines on a scroll ' of Erinna's poems.'

' This small, sweet book is mightier far
Than all our learned poets are.
Alas that death so swiftly came
To quench Erinna's maiden fame.
For nineteen summers scarce had flown
'Ere Pluto seized her for his own.'

A.P. vii. 11.

Of the three poets Hedylus, who was, as his name shows, a son born out of lawful wedlock, seems to have been distinguished for a certain vigour of satire. ' The Daughter of limb-relaxing ' Bacchus and of limb-relaxing Aphrodite,' he writes, ' is limb- ' relaxing Gout.' This and four other short pieces are all that now remain of his in the Anthology, and the three most characteristic specimens of his style are preserved for us by Athenaeus. One is an epigram on a greedy lady, the other two are convivial songs addressed to one Socles—' A more sturdy fellow even than ' Sikelidas himself.'

' From eve till break of day
From morning until night
Let pleasure still hold sway
And drink and love and write.
Drink, boys, and drink amain ;
While fast the wine-cups fly
Some new sweet subtle strain
Shall grace our revelry.
Drench me with wine. Life is but vain,
Unless I drink and drink again.'

Posidippus is a more graceful writer, with a much wider range, and both in style and feeling closely resembles Asclepiades. Counting pieces of doubtful authorship we have just over twenty epigrams by him remaining in the Anthology, together with a few more preserved by Athenaeus. By Posidippus probably is the charming madrigal to Irene—' the flower of beauty, from

'head to foot carved of white marble, laden with virgin graces.' To Posidippus also it is best to attribute the delightful piece of sportive verse, 'The Bather,' with its fantastic conceit of fire and water—

'Along the beach where Love was born
Cleander strolled one summer morn
And saw his Nico swimming there
Breasting the waves with bosom bare.
He saw and burned: for strange to say
Water gave birth to fire that day,
And from the briny drops she threw
A parching fire within him grew.
She tossed the waves with dimpled arm
And shoreward turned nor knew of harm.
But he who on the dry land stayed
Most lamentable shipwreck made.
Yet all proved well. An equal love
Venus has sent them from above.
The boon he asked has granted been
And now he thanks our sea-born queen.'

A.P. v. 209.

When Asclepiades and his two friends left Samos for Alexandria, we do not exactly know. But it was some time after 290 B.C. when he and Philetas were invited there by Ptolemy Soter at the suggestion of Demetrius of Phalerum. That strange personage, a scholar of encyclopædic knowledge and yet devoted to the lowest vices, a philosopher who put rouge upon his cheeks and kept half-a-dozen mistresses, a ruler who squandered the revenues of the State on cooks, minions and parasites, was at last driven into exile from Athens in 290 B.C. by an unsympathetic people and took refuge in Egypt, devoting himself henceforward to the congenial task of organising the library and museum and selecting the first members of the new academies that Ptolemy was then in the process of founding. Philetas became tutor of Ptolemy's son and head of the library; whether Asclepiades held any official post is doubtful; probably he was given a money allowance and permitted to exercise his poetical talent as seemed best to himself.

We may picture the subtle Greek making his way through the crowded streets of the busy port, elbowed by Jewish traders and Macedonian soldiers of fortune, or resting in the quiet gardens

that surrounded the Museum buildings where the King's pensioners were lodged. One evening he would be invited to a royal banquet and in the company of courtesans and flute players pass the hours with music and song: on another he would dine with the other Fellows in their common room and discuss the respective merits of Homer and Hesiod. Often doubtless he took part in such a festival as Theocritus describes in the Adoniazousae, and for a statue of Queen Berenice—'the 'fourth Grace, whom Aphrodite herself, men say, rendered 'immortal'—he writes these lines—

'Is it Berenice's face,
Or the Cyprian's smiling grace?
Which is which? To say I'm loth,
This one statue stands for both.'

A.P. xvi. 68.

This is the only one of his surviving poems that contains a definite reference to Alexandrian life, for the lines attributed to him in the Anthology on Queen Cleopatra's amethyst ring cannot possibly be by Asclepiades, since the first Egyptian princess of that name lived many years after his death. The epigrams on Hesiod and Alexander's statue are also spurious, and discarding the Soros poems we are left finally with some thirty epigrams that are indisputably from his pen.

Of his dedicatory poems only one remains, written to celebrate a child's first victory, his writing prize at school, commemorated by the offering of a comic mask in the temple of the Muses.

'Young Connar won the writing prize
And eighty marbles proudly took.
The children clapped with wondering eyes,
So fair his copy book.
All honour to the Muses be;
To them he gives this laughing face,
Old Chares' mask where still we see
His comical grimace.'

A.P. vi. 308.

Of the five epitaphs three probably belong to the Soros volume. Of the two others, which seem to be written at a later period, one is on a shipwrecked sailor, the other is a delicate little poem on a seaside grave, one of those simple monuments

that can be built so close to the waters of the tideless Mediterranean.

'Hold back thou boisterous sea,
For these few yards refrain,
And roar and billow free
Within thine own domain.
For if thou be unkind
And wreck these funeral stones
No treasure wilt thou find
But only dust and bones.'

A.P. vii. 284.

In dedication and in epitaph, Asclepiades follows a long established tradition of verse. In the other sections of his work, the colloquial and the amatory poems, he strikes out a new path which his successors, Greek and Latin, were destined to follow with such brilliant success. Unfortunately of his light, humourous pieces only two survive. The first 'The Rakes' 'Progress' with its Latin slang and quick tripping sentences, is the perfection of impromptu, as the young gallant rails against his steward—

'Five wreathes! When will he come, I say!
What's that I hear your grunt—"Assez?"
"You've got no change," deuce take you then;
Servants forsooth, you're highwaymen.
"You've done no wrong," well, we will see
Here, Jenny, bring his book to me.
"Five shillings wine." You dirty dog!
I'll truss you up, you Lapith hog!
And what's this—"Sausage, half a crown,
"Fish, eggs and pastry," all put down,
"And honey"—Stop. I've had enough.
To-morrow I'll go through the stuff.
Now off to Truefitt's, and be quick
Unless you want to feel my stick.
Five silver vials I must have
One for each kiss my darling gave.
Our bed was witness to my vow,
And I must pay the price, I trow.'

A.P. v. 181.

The other piece, imitated by Posidippus, is in the same but slightly quieter key: a list of commissions for a servant to perform, the humour lying in the ascending climax of expense.

'Now, Pat, be off and don't be late.
Three herrings buy at Billingsgate
And then some sprats—say half a score—
And prawns—he'll count them—twenty-four.
The florist's shop is on your way
So don't forget a big bouquet
And while you're there you might invite
My darling Belle to come to-night.'

A.P. v. 185.

This is the realistic side of love, in the world of spendthrifts and parasites, flute girls and courtesans, wherein Asclepiades lived; the side that stirred Lucretius to his outbursts of indignation; where money ceases to be sacred and is lavished wantonly to gratify an idle fancy. True love, in our sense of the word, was obviously impossible when the object of a lover's affections was herself usually a slave, a piece of property earning money for her master, and only able to indulge her own inclinations in so far as they did not run counter to her owner's will. Asclepiades himself expressed the cruel irony of such a position in 'The 'Girdle'—

'It fell that once upon a day
I with Hermione would play;
And round her waist did then behold
A girdle bright with words in gold:
It said "Come take me if you will,
"Nor grieve if I'm another's still."'

A.P. v. 158.

But such romance as could be extracted from these mercenary amours Asclepiades gets into his verse. Often he is curiously modern in tone, in the French rather than the English style, another Chénier or de Musset, as in the despairing cry of the rejected lover.

'Long are the hours, the storm winds blow,
Night passes ere the Pleiads set;
But still before her door I go
With driving rain all wet.

This is not love, this torturing smart,
These arrows forged in flaming fire;
I know her false, but yet my heart
Still burns with mad desire.'

A.P. v. 159.

'Amor improbus'—the love that forces a man against his will to cleave to an unworthy mistress, to linger in the rain and darkness before her door, the love that Catullus felt when he wrote 'odi et amo': such is the passion that inspires Asclepiades. Sometimes he writes in a tone of mocking resignation:—

'She cometh not: the watch is past,
And still I wait alone at home;
By our great Queen she gave her oath,
And promised she would come.

But ah, she will not keep her troth;
'Tis time, my lads, put out the light,
Too many call on Nico's name;
She will not come to-night.'

A.P. v. 150.

In another poem, a reminiscence of his youth, he reminds us of Burns, the little Cupids for him taking the place of the banks and braes of bonny Doon.

'My years scarce twenty are and two
Yet life is naught but grief and pain.
Ye cruel Loves, why vex me so,
Why burn my heart in vain!

What will ye do, ye wingéd boys
When I to death shall come at last?
Doubtless you still will keep your toys,
Your dice unheeding cast.'

A.P. xii. 46.

So sings Asclepiades in his hours of melancholy. But he is not always sad, and like our own poet he can rail against lovers who are too wan and pale.

'Drink Asclepiades,' he cries, 'and forget the frailty of 'women.'

'Why these tears, these streaming eyes!
You are not the only prize
Venus holds beneath her sway:
Drink and drive dull care away.

There are other bleeding hearts
Cupid tortures with his darts.
While you live love's power defy,
Nor in dust and ashes lie.'

A.P. xii. 50.

Or again he looks with sardonic humour upon himself and his false mistress, and appeals to her lamp with burlesque solemnity to help him.

'Three times she swore that she would come
And called her lamp to hear the oath
Now with another doth she roam
Inconstant to us both.

Bring to my aid thy power divine
And when she holds her man to-night
And fain before his eyes would shine ;
Put out, dear lamp, thy light.'

A.P. v. 7.

But he does not forget to proclaim also the delights and raptures of love, and nothing can be more tender than his petition :—

'Why, why so careful, O my sweet,
So jealous of thy virgin bloom !
No lover's lips thy lips will meet
When once to death they come.

Nay, let us live and let us love
Before we pass in dust away,
And all the joys of Venus prove
While there is time to-day.'

A.P. v. 85.

Equally beautiful is the companion piece in which he tells of love's fruition :—

'Sweet after storm to sailor's eyes
Are zephyrs in the vernal skies.
To thirsty lips a cup is sweet
Fresh cooled with snow in summer's heat.
But sweeter still when man and maid
Lie hidden close beneath one plaid,
And in its warmth together pressed
See all the might of love confessed.'

A.P. v. 169.

How far these emotions are genuine, how far they merely serve as an occasion for verse are questions, with Asclepiades, that admit of no very definite answer. He is certainly an artist before all, and it is the vivid grace of his love poems rather than their emotional force that gives them their charm. But in clearness of presentment he is unrivalled, and in a few lines can draw a picture that it is hard to forget. Here for example is his portrait

of Dorcion, the 'young gazelle,' who long before our days delighted to appear in a semi-male disguise :—

'She seems a soft cheeked boy
As with the men she goes
And from her eyes in joy
A glance voluptuous throws.

Her cap and cloak loose hung
Float lightly in the air
And from her shoulder flung
Leave all her white thigh bare.'

A.P. xii. 161.

This dramatic quality appears equally plainly in the little vignette of the girl waiting for her lover :—

'Oft would she gaze from out the lattice high,
Her cheeks with longing wet, and lonely cry
Till he came to her door.
But Cleophon's blue eyes with their bright fire
Have dried her tears and filled her heart's desire ;
And now she weeps no more.'

A.P. v. 153.

These attempts at translation give only the faintest idea of the grace and charm of the Greek originals : but perhaps even from them it may be possible to realise the exquisite truth of Meleager's criticism when he chose the anemone as the flower best corresponding to Asclepiades. The Samian poet's verse has all the bright colour and the delicate shape of the wind-blossom, but it has also its fragility and its absence of scent. His poems are beautiful, but as compared with Sappho and Meleager, they are as the anemone to the rose and violet : they are flowers, but they lack the essential quality of flowers—perfume.

F. A. Wright.

A SCIENCE OF SOCIETY

1. Introduction to Sociology. By J. J. Findlay. Manchester: University Press. 1920.
2. A Philosophy of Social Progress. By E. J. Urwick. 2nd ed. Methuen. 1920.
3. Principles of Sociology. By E. A. Ross. New York: Century Co. 1920.
4. Social Theory. By G. D. H. Cole. Methuen. 1920.
5. The Group Mind. By Wm. Macdougall. Cambridge University Press. 1920.
6. Community: A Sociological Study. By R. M. MacIver. 2nd. ed. Macmillan. 1920.

THE publication, within a few weeks of one another, of the above notable group of books implies a more considerable interest in the problems of society than has been manifest since the days of Herbert Spencer. The ferment of the ideas and ideals of the twentieth century, the stresses and strains upon the social fabric resulting from the war, and the increasing sense of social values have produced both the occasion and the motive for such an awakened interest. New and powerful forces are changing the status and relations of groups and classes, altering customs and turning social thought and activity into new channels. The whole structure of society is being modified. New functions are proposed for familiar institutions; a new social balance is being set up; new forms of control and new social relations are demanded. Readjustment is certain and imminent. But unless that readjustment is to be blind, haphazard and possibly retrogressive, the whole situation in which society finds itself must be studied scientifically and impartially. No well-organised and rationally-directed community, such as is each of the Anglo-Saxon peoples, can allow vital changes to impinge upon the *status quo* without systematic inquiry into their nature and probable effects. Such scientific, ordered investigation into social tendencies is the subject matter, as well as the *rationale*, of sociology.

In illustration one might dwell at length upon one or many of the problems of communal life. A most characteristic aspect

of this century has been the progressive emancipation of women and children. Legislation, economic action and some force commonly designated ' the spirit of the age ' are making the lot of childhood more comfortable, and giving women greater independence. Home life has lost much of its discipline and restraint, whilst school has become more of a playground and less of a prison. On the economic side, boys and girls in their adolescence are receiving wages affording them greater relative individual spending power than that enjoyed by many adults. As for women, their economic independence is becoming more real than ever before, whilst their political independence has been achieved.

These changes, however, have not taken place without serious questioning as to their significance in regard to the institutions of marriage and the family. To what extent and in what sense has the family ceased to be an economic unit ? For even if, in an industrial sense, it is no longer an economic unit, its needs are the basis for most theories and calculations of a minimum wage, and every worker has a clear sense of the meaning and importance of family earnings. On its social side, Mr. Cole maintains that the family has ' become far less a social and far ' more a purely personal unit.' (' Social Theory,' p. 12.) He describes it as a private group whose members contribute to society only as individuals. Its social functions, he asserts, have been reduced to those of ' the getting and upbringing of children.' If this is so, one asks precisely how this evolution has been achieved, and what is its significance. Similarly, one might pass to marriage and inquire the extent and significance of recent economic, political and social proposals and changes upon that institution. Is the greater economic and political independence of women likely to affect the form, nature or stability of marriage relations, and, if so, in what direction ? These are but types of questions concerning the effects of such new social forces as are referred to above.

Further illustrations might be drawn from the political and economic spheres. Here, the last few decades have witnessed a change in social equilibrium consequent upon the growing organised strength and class consciousness of manual workers, whose use of the instrument of collective bargaining has become tremendously effective. They have grouped themselves with

such solidarity as to be a political entity. They have considerable chances of soon controlling the legislation of this country, and thus reversing what they deem the injustice and oppression of the past. They are not entering upon this political heritage without plan or programme. Upon the anvil of strife and struggle, they have beaten out a weapon which, they trust, will cleave their way to the promised land. There they propose to set up a fairly co-ordinated scheme of economic and political organisation to the making of which the author of 'Social Theory' has made important contributions, not the least of which are to be found in the work under review. They have not merely reached the conclusion voiced by Professor Kirkaldy at the Cardiff meeting of the British Science Association, that the present capitalistic system is doomed; they have adumbrated the system that is to replace it. In so doing, as Mr. Cole's book shows, they have thrown a challenge to the previously omnipotent State, the supreme and inclusive institution, which has hitherto comprehended and regulated all others. This challenge cannot be allowed to pass by default. Nor can society afford a policy of drift. Progressive evolution calls for a study of social relationships, an investigation of the principles underlying social development, and an evaluation of the methods and ends of the forces that are tending to modify social structure. Through this study, it is hoped that paths of harmonious readjustment to a better order of society may become revealed. To discover them is the task and province of the sociologist.

Lest one should come to regard the problems of Great Britain as those to which the sociologist should give his sole attention, let us turn to the world at large. Here one finds a variety of social phenomena reflecting the ferment of the age. Throughout Europe, what were formerly subject races have established their freedom and are struggling along the thorny path of nationhood. In setting up the States through which these peoples are to function politically, questions have inevitably arisen, and still call for settlement, concerning such determining factors of national self-consciousness as territory, geographical and economic conditions, racial constitution and language. In India and Egypt the British Empire is faced with a demand for the application of the principle of self-determination. America is continuing to receive a stream of immigration from Europe

so constituted racially as to make difficult the process of assimilation. Here and elsewhere there has been a growing self-consciousness among the several black and yellow races, upon whom the last few decades have exercised a profound quickening influence. Professor Ross, who has made a special study of the situation in China and Japan, reminds us that in the quarter of a century that has elapsed since the outbreak of the China-Japanese war, 'the situation of the white race with respect 'to other races has changed more than in the three centuries 'preceding.' ('Principles of Sociology,' p. 541.) Of Soviet Russia one needs to say little, except that it is a great country in dissolution, lying between a Europe in the ferment of a national resettlement, and an Asia which has learnt to despise the dogma of the superiority of the white race.

The impulses behind these racial and national upheavals are of considerable importance for the future of civilisation and the destinies of the world. Too little time and attention has been devoted to their study; the action taken has, in too many cases, been opportunistic. Before wise decisions can ensue, there must be full comprehension of the issues involved, and deeper and more scientific study of group life, racial factors and national qualities. The war threw civilisation with all its culture, institutions and geographical provinces into the melting pot, and only the co-operative efforts of skilled refiners will succeed in bringing out again the burnished gold. Among these refiners are those who work in the sociologists' laboratory.

Survey of the situation in society at large shows how necessary is full and careful study of human relationships as a whole, discussion and examination of the motives which underlie group action, analysis and measurement of the forces which condition the functioning of human and social relationships, and an endeavour to point the pathway to harmony and progress.

But whether sociology, understood in content and aim as above described, is or can be a science, is still disputed. Professor Urwick, in the work under review, states his belief that social life cannot be reduced to a science. To his mind, sociology

'is not a science of social life, for there cannot be such a science: but it is a growing body of scientific knowledge concerning some of the conditions under which social life is lived.' (p. 16).

Each of the social sciences, economics, political science,

eugenics, psychology, education and so forth, is able to illuminate some one fact or other of experience. The business of the sociologist is

> ' to focus as many of these rays as he can upon this or that problem considered as a whole, and upon the general process of social life and change.' (p. 8).

To this challenge one can make two replies. In the first place, Professor Urwick has left to sociology a fairly comprehensive content. He will allow the sociologist to give attention to ' the material universe of which we are a part, with its conditions ' of force and energy by which our powers are circumscribed, ' and also, by right use, enlarged,' that is, the geographical and material environment : to ' the universe of living things,' the biological environment : to ' the universe of human minds,' the psychological elements in human relationships : and to ' the universe of social units,' the group or associated life in and through which our material environment is appropriated to social uses, and biological and psychological elements of our personality find their exemplification and explanation. Whilst he would exclude the philosophy of ends and values from the contents of sociological thought, he is, on his own showing, prepared to hand over to the sociologist the task of surveying the processes of social life and change as a whole. This is what the sociologist does claim as his province, and to the need of such a comprehensive survey he is always drawing attention.

The challenge to the scientific nature of sociology is more serious. No one can deny the difficulties which confront sociologists in their attempt to develop a scientific technique. To some who write upon the subject, technique is a secondary consideration. Thus, Professor Findlay puts the problem aside. He is content to speak of ' our so-called science of ' sociology.' The best he can hope from such work as that of Professors Graham Wallas and L. T. Hobhouse is the admission that ' men are now creating a novel instrument of thought, a ' specialized tool for the impersonal consideration of social ' behaviour.' (' Introduction to Sociology,' p. 19.) He seems to remain content with ' a consistent scheme of definitions, ' types, principles ' applied by the abstracting intellect to the concrete, changing phenomena of social life. He does not

attempt ' a scientific explanation of the social forces operating ' around us to-day,' nor offer ' a view of development in earlier ' civilisation.' His aim is to build up a system of thought through which all social relationships, past and present, will become intelligible.

But such an attitude is not equivalent to acceptance of the impossibility of arriving at a science of sociology. ' An Introduction to Sociology ' is not a scientific text-book, but it is an illuminating and penetrating discussion of communal relationships. To change the metaphor, it has done its part in clearing a path through what the author calls ' the jungle of social ' questions,' and to that extent has brought us all nearer the clear-cut road which sociologists will travel when the outlines of their science have been determined. Its author is as anxious as any that a scientific explanation of social forces and processes shall be forthcoming.

On the other hand, most professed sociologists are seeking to make their subject subscribe to the canons of science. This very endeavour on their part is a tacit recognition of the charge made by Professor Urwick that sociology is not yet a science. But none of them would admit that sociology cannot become a science. The possibility of a scientific technique in respect of the study of communal relationships to-day is equal to that of psychology twenty or thirty years ago. Astronomy, biology, chemistry and psychology have attained rank as sciences through laborious perfection of their technique, with corresponding attention to definition and terminology. Sociology can take no other course, and there are no apparent reasons why it should not accept the challenge.

One of the obstacles to the speedy, definite formulation of a scientific method for sociology is that it has to make use of the results of many other sciences. As Comte has reminded us, a science which, because of its later development in the hierarchy of sciences, is dependent on others, can advance only in proportion as these others perfect their technique and become exact in their results and conclusions. The science of sociology is waiting upon other sciences, and, though its demands may impel them to hasten their own development, it cannot advance faster than they. Whilst it is not matter or content which determines scientific standing, but rather method or technique, the extent to which

sociological technology is retarded will become clearer on an examination of its subject matter.

As suggested in outline earlier, sociology aims at a study of social origins, structures and activities, that is, of social relations in their genesis, their form and their functioning. Of these social relations the nucleus is the group, and the actions and interactions of groups are the content of social life. The determining factors of major importance in this stimulus and interaction are the material environment, the group members as individuals, and group reactions and interactions upon groups and their members. If the group be accepted as the nucleus, these factors may be condensed into the environment, the group constitution and group interaction.

To discuss the nature and influences of the material environment is not a part of the purpose of this article. But if one analyses the environment into such concrete elements as climate, natural resources, occupational diversities and so forth, one realises at a glance how little the influence of these factors on social development has been submitted to measurement, the basis of scientific treatment and discussion. Few men could say off-hand what science deals, or should deal, with a subject so important in the history of civilisation as climate, and none can deny its paucity of development. This is not intended to depreciate the work that has been done, either in its extent or its quality. The observations and conclusions of such students as Ward, Ellsworth Huntington, Semple, Dexter and Fleure have done much to elucidate the effect of temperature, rainfall, humidity and so forth upon individuals in their social relations and upon groups. But their work only points the way to further possibilities. So with the factors of natural resources and occupational diversities. The literature of sociology contains many illuminating generalisations on these matters, but it would seem as if these must for a while be accepted and tested as inductions, not as quantitatively measured relations. If this attitude be adopted, there will be found available a body of data of entrancing interest. Thus, the researches of Professor Ellsworth Huntington in Central Asia, (see ' The Pulse of Asia '), and elsewhere have shown the presence of climatic cycles, and have demonstrated that at Anau an advanced civilisation perished when desiccation of the soil drove out the city's inhabitants. Others have shown how

economic conditions have affected domestic and social organization: how ease or difficulty of communication has prompted or hindered social advance, and how the kind of occupation general in the community has influenced the size of the group, its constitution and organization, the relations of its members to one another, and the feelings, ideas and customs of the people.

But in whatever form we are willing to accept conclusions on these matters, there remains a vast unexplored storehouse of material which, when opened up, will enable us better to understand the group life of man in its material setting. Until this has been explored, and the treasures it will yield set out in systematic order, sociology will fall short of its task of synthesising all factors affecting social life into a scientific unity. In this case undoubtedly, as suggested above, sociology waits upon the development of a sister science.

When the sociologist passes to the second factor, the nature of the human beings composing the group, he has to face a similar difficulty. He has still to wait upon the conclusions of other sciences, especially anthropology, biology and psychology. To the first he looks for the facts of the evolution of man, so far as his physical and cultural development is concerned. From biology he seeks conclusions which will guide him concerning man as the parent of the race, his birth rate and death rate, the biological process of his present achievement and the possibilities of a higher physical evolution. Psychology offers him an interpretation of the thought and feeling of man, and of the inbred impulses that stir mankind to action, both individual and collective. The doctrine of instincts, the most recent contribution of psychology has undoubtedly thrown much light upon the individual and social life of man.

But sociology must wait for much also in the case of these sciences. Anthropology has great potentialities, and is a subject in which work of the greatest merit is being done. But it has not perfected its technique, and has scarcely entered upon its field. It is by no means an exact science, and is as much prone to subjectivism as was psychology three decades ago. Biology has advanced greatly within living memory, but it has not a clear-cut answer to those problems of the birth rate, natural selection and the nature and social effects of heredity, for the solution of which the sociologist is looking.

Psychology, too, cannot give a decisive or authoritative answer to the sociologist. Psychologists are divided into several camps, one of which, the American 'Behaviourists,' cares very little for the social aspects of the subject. Even the others, who have devoted attention to the springs and motives of social action, are equally divided. Professor MacDougall, supported and followed by many, finds the bases of social relations in instincts. Against this view, Professor Urwick and others utter a feeble protest, preferring the explanation of a social impulse or drive. Another school of sociologists finds the psychological basis of communal relations in certain objects of will which stimulate to activity. This school, originated by the Austrian, Ratzenhofer, has among its modern adherents Professor Small of Chicago, Professor Ross and Mr. MacIver. The last named, differing widely from Professor MacDougall, has analysed into various classes those objects of will that generate social activity, and by their changes partly determine social evolution. There are general interests which promote associations of social intercourse and camaraderie, and ultimate interests based on organic or psychical needs. Organic interests include those which promote marriage and the family. Certain classes of interests, the political and economic, are derivative in the sense of being means to an ultimate interest. To pursue these various interests in specific ways, communities must create associations. At this point the influence of 'Community' upon the author of 'Social Theory' becomes apparent, and the functional principle of the latter is little other than the doctrine of interests. One is not surprised, therefore, that the Guild Socialists are making 'Community' their sociological text.

This discussion of the inability of psychology to demonstrate the nature of the forces which prompt the individual to social relationships has led us to trespass somewhat upon the third universe, that of the interaction of groups upon individual members and other groups. In this case we are entering upon the major content of sociology. In the study of this aspect of social activity two methods are of chief importance, the genetic and the psychological. The former surveys group life as a process in evolution. The working of the principle of association is sought first in the animal world, in the life of the pack, the hive and the herd. The differentiating principle in the genesis of the

social mind, by which man rose above the beasts, is found in the capacity for variation, and in the sense of a consciousness of kind, the recognition that other beings feel and act as oneself. To attain data along these lines, the sociologist joins hands with the naturalist, the anthropologist and the ethnologist to find the principle of human association through the study of social origins and the development of culture. The genetic method leads into the historic, so far at least as the history of civilisation is concerned. It is not without significance in this connection that the chair occupied by Professor Franklin H. Giddings, of Columbia University, is designated as a chair of Sociology and the History of Civilisation.

But the psychological method of study is the most fruitful point of approach. For at least a decade, social psychology has been regarded as the chief element in the study of sociology. Professor Ross started off as a sociologist by such works as ' An ' Introduction to Social Psychology,' and continued with a psychological study of ' Social Control.' Professor Hobhouse, of the London School of Economics, builds his sociology upon a basis of psychology. In this connection ' The Group Mind ' recently published by Professor MacDougall is of special value. It represents the most complete and specific application yet known of psychology to the phenomena of collective life. But its author must be added to those witnesses whose evidence goes to prove that the basic sciences upon which sociology must build have not yet been fully developed. He confesses that his own work in his ' Introduction to Social Psychology ' and in ' The Group 'Mind ' has not yet covered the whole field of social psychology. The latter subject ' has also to describe and account for the ' influence of the group on the growth and activities of the ' individual.'

But beyond the contribution of social psychology lies the unexplored territory of social organization. Groups exist to function in interaction. Through this common life, social relationships are established and institutions become permanent. Economic, political and religious groups arise to meet the needs of associated life and are worked into a system, the elasticity of which is a function, in the mathematical sense, of the geographical environment and of the psychology of man. Industrial and political systems react upon the place of the individual within

the group and the relationships of groups to one another. The State arises as the chief political organization, able to compel a certain degree of co-operation between individuals and groups, but leaving place for a large amount of voluntary, spontaneous associational life.

In this last and larger part of sociology, the sociologist has to blaze his own trail. He can fall back to a certain extent upon the results of political science, and, as Professor Findlay points out, far too many British thinkers upon sociological questions have done so. But even within the field where political theory helps, the sociologist has his own view-point and submits the facts to different treatment. He goes behind the State as it is to the origins of the principles of authority and social control, and seeks to furnish a genetic explanation of political structures. Political science deals with organised authority manifest in the State ; sociology treats of society in general in its origin and its becoming. Outside the purview of political science are all those voluntary associations which comprise by far the greater part of social activity. These need to be described and analysed, and the laws of their development and functioning formulated with the precision achieved by the political scientist in the analysis of the nature, structure and functions of the State.

But few sociologists are satisfied with even so large a programme as above defined. They are not content merely to investigate and tabulate, they seek to correlate social phenomena and discover their relations in order to formulate laws of social action. They wish to determine standards or norms, to point the way to harmonious communal development. To attain this end they must discuss values, determining the worth of social institutions and forces, and their fitness to achieve ends desirable from the standpoint of the welfare and progress of the community. In this task, they march step by step with the students of social ethics and the social philosophers, though without surrendering their own point of view or their scientific attitude. Only those to whom science is purely material and exact can object to this procedure. As Mr. MacIver has pointed out (pp. 59 et seq.), the facts of sociology are in many cases facts of values, and as such are subservient to scientific treatment.

This analysis tends to establish the place of sociology as that of a synthesising science, taking up the results of a number of

special sciences and focussing these results upon the general problem of the origin, structure and functions of society. The sciences of geography, climatology, physical and social anthropology, biology (especially those aspects of it comprised in genetics and eugenics), psychology, economics, political science and social ethics contribute to the explanation of the activity of mankind on one side or another. But they fail in their adequacy, even collectively, to interpret the whole life of society. Communal action is a resultant of many forces, and the student of such activity is concerned with the result primarily and with the contingent forces secondarily. This is the justification for Mr. MacIver's challenge in the preface to his second edition (p. xii). The scientific text book in sociology, which has yet to be written, will not be divisible into sections characterised by material borrowed from one or other of the special social sciences. On the contrary, it will start with the whole society, and study its genesis, nature and organisation, finding explanations in the character of individuals and groups and in their activities as determined by the interaction of environment on personality and communal life.

Such a method, to be scientific, calls for the fullest and most exact calculation of correlations. Science is investigation or observation followed by tabulation, classification and correlation. The subject matter of the exact sciences is measurable, consisting of data which can be isolated, have a relative uniformity and are repeated so that they can be counted. These conditions are held to be absent to such a degree in social phenomena that sociology is thereby precluded from becoming a science. It is said that such phenomena are infinitely complex, and subject to a variability commensurate with their connection with human personalities. Even if all this be true, it must be remembered that no natural phenomenon is single or simple, except in isolation, whilst an appreciable measure of variability exists even in those that have been isolated and measured. Until social scientists have failed to isolate social facts and measure their variability, the difficulty above stated cannot become a proof of the impossibility of a science of sociology.

Further, social phenomena that do fulfil all the above scientific tests are fairly numerous and of considerable significance concerning communal life. Birth and death rates, figures for

marriages, divorces, crime, poverty, accidents, unemployment, wages, industrial disputes, exercise of the suffrage, emigration and immigration, and a great variety of other data are being collected with increasing care and accuracy. This vast mass of public and private statistics affords a body of facts that have been isolated. At the same time, the science of statistics itself has developed the technique by which correlations may be tested and established between two or a number of such measurable phenomena. There can be no doubt that the use of the statistical method by sociologists will enable them to find correlations between phenomena that have not seemed to be connected. Thus Mr. Dexter (a young American sociologist) in a study of the effects of altitude and climate upon conduct has shown how muggy weather conduces in a measurable degree to unrest and disorder. Correlations equally exact and significant await the attention of sociologists. For example, Professor MacDougall remarks (p. 214) on the obvious increase in height in the Australian-born children of British colonists, and asserts the general view that this is the direct effect of climate. Now, by the application of the statistical method, especially that known as the co-efficient of correlation, the average increase in height of such children can be measured, and the influence calculated of such factors as climate, urban or rural life and fuller sustenance. In further illustration of the possibilities of the statistical method one may mention the reference of Professor MacDougall to the development of new physical qualities among the immigrants of North America. This conclusion, and the extent and trend of the tendency, were established by the anthropologist, Professor Franz Boas, of Columbia University, through a statistical study into the head-form of native-born children of immigrants into the United States.

If, then, we admit that sociology is dependent for its development upon a great number of sciences, which are themselves far from being complete, do we admit that sociology is not a science ? Whilst we have demonstrated that the increase of these other sciences in systematic accuracy will furnish more definite knowledge of conditioning factors in our common life, have we disproved Professor Urwick's charge that prevision of social change is impossible ? (' Philosophy of Social Progress,' p. vi.) On the first question, we have Mr. MacIver's book as a

reply. Its author has asked himself whether sociology is ' a real ' science or only a bundle of snippets hung on a thread of good ' intentions ? ' His own answer is that it is ' a real science still ' in its infancy.' In this view he would be supported by most of the authors under review. Especially is one impelled to quote Professor MacDougall's view, expressed towards the close of his survey of the development of national character. ' In many ' directions—by the historians, the biologists, the anthropologists, ' the statisticians—data are being gathered for a science of society ' whose sure indications will enable us deliberately to guide the ' further evolution of the nation towards the highest ideal for a ' nation that we can conceive.' (p. 300.)

It is for the opportunity to establish the science of society that sociologists are pleading. They regard their subject as having a legitimate place in the circles of the sciences. It is not merely investigational in function, confining its attention to the ills and diseases of society. The social investigator, as such, is not a sociologist. Nor is the study of society identical with the promulgation of Utopian visions of a reconstructed social order. The sociologist is not necessarily nor usually a socialist of any one of the several schools. Rather is he aiming to become an authoritative teacher concerning the significance of social phenomena. He can probably render a distinct service in days when the ferment of a new social order is abroad and is bursting the old wine skins. By examining forms of social organization and correlating influences that promote social development he may be able to map out a path along which nations may progress. The younger generation of sociologists, trained in the statistics of correlation as well as in the special social sciences, are hopeful of establishing, within a measurable margin of error, definite tendencies among social phenomena from which prevision may become increasingly possible.

Clarence H. Northcott.

ADULT EDUCATION

1. Education and Social Movements, 1700-1850. By A. E. Dodds. Longmans, Green. 1919.
2. An Adventure in Working Class Education. By Albert Mansbridge. Longmans, Green. 1920.
3. Adult Education Committee. Final Report. Cmd. 321. 1919.

ENGLISHMEN are rarely enthusiastic for education. To many persons the word itself is actually deterrent: they are repelled by its so-called 'questions,' by its technical details, by its air of official mystery; excluded from its *arcana*, they accept the position of the profane. As a result of this national aloofness, there has seldom been in this country any strong or definite pressure of public opinion behind educational movements. Progress, as is shown by Mr. Dodds in his suggestive volume, has followed, often tardily, changes in the current of religious or political thought, in philanthropic effort, in economic developments, in the advance of science, in the structure of society and the relative forces of national life. It has alternately flickered and flared. It has been neither deliberate nor continuous; it has rather been intermittent, reflecting both in its advance and recoil the success or failure of new social ideals. Nor has the lack of consistent interest been compensated by the courageous far-seeing genius of constructive statesmanship. We have had no John Knox, no Falk or Stein, no Code Napoléon. We have made no systematic provision for the maintenance of schools such as was made by the Puritans of New England. Our edifice of public instruction is a rambling structure, which has grown up by adaptations, accretions and compromises, without symmetry or design, in a manner characteristic of the traditions of our race. Only during the last half-century has any educational system, based on definite lines of public policy, begun to struggle into existence. Its present efficiency is scarcely twenty years old. It is only within the last few months that the Ministry of Education has been recognised as one of first-class importance in the hierarchy of public offices.

The nation may have to pay dearly for its apathy. It is already in the rapids, and to reach smooth water and avoid

disaster it will need the most widely diffused intelligence. International and imperial problems, as well as social questions of great complexity at home, urgently demand solution. They will tax to the utmost the wisdom of the community and, without knowledge, wisdom, though often lingering, is rarely attainable. There is, moreover, another danger. Contemporary history affords striking examples of the formative power of higher education when it is controlled and concentrated towards a definite end. In Japan, and in Germany, almost within the lifetime of a generation, it has altered the psychology of a people and changed the current of national life. In Soviet Russia the power of the weapon is recognised, and the schools are turned into instruments of propaganda. To-day, in this country, similar means are being already employed for similarly one-sided ends. The question whether the new industrial order is to be evolved by the sympathy and understanding of an enlightened democracy, or erected on the ruins of civilisation by a class-conscious proletariat, may very largely depend on the national attitude towards adult education.

Even without special circumstances, and without the social ferment which is the aftermath of war, a growing demand for adult education is naturally to be expected from the increased provision of public instruction. For the last twenty years, boys and girls have passed out of our elementary schools incomparably better equipped with interests and enthusiasm for the things of the mind than at any previous period of our history. They have received a liberal education in the sense that it is not vocational or professional, but trains them as men and women and as citizens. Their courses of instruction are complete in themselves, coherent, self-consistent; they are differentiated from those of secondary and public schools rather in degree than in kind; they are distinguished less by the subjects taught than by the length of time which can be bestowed on their study. They form a training not only in the means of livelihood but in the means of life. They are supplemented by the facilities for the passage of clever children from elementary to secondary schools, by evening classes and by continuation schools.

All this public provision would have miserably failed, if it had not stimulated the thirst for more knowledge, whether that knowledge is or is not of commercial value. It would fail, if it

did not prepare and train, and encourage young people to become —and as long as life lasts, to continue—to be their own self-teachers. It would fail, if it did not quicken the sense of the inward need for mental and moral cultivation, whether that cultivation does or does not bear any visible relation to worldly success. Its fruit is not measured by the number of bald facts which it has imparted to pupils. Its true test is rather the interest aroused and the enthusiasm created. Bacon said of the sun that it was not only good to see by, but to see. What he said of the light of heaven is true also of learning. It is good for its practical utility, and as a guide in difficulties ; it is good also if, without thought of its professional value, we only have a growing taste and love for its pursuit—if we only delight in its warmth and rejoice in its radiance.

Side by side with the growth of a desire for personal development by humane studies, another influence, distinct but converging, powerfully strengthens the demand for adult education on non-vocational lines. It is the outcome of political and economic changes, of the ferment of new social ideals, of the gathering force of the associated efforts of working people themselves. The new consciousness of power, with the accompanying sense of the grave responsibilities of citizenship, heightens the interest in the problems of the day, and expresses itself in the desire to qualify for intelligent membership of industrial, social and political organizations. Both influences are living, growing forces. They are a guarantee that the demand for adult education is not a passing fashion, but meets a permanent need which is already widely felt. On the one hand, the continuous systematic public instruction of ' young persons ' up to the age of sixteen, and ultimately of eighteen, will provide a constant flow of those who desire to pursue liberal studies into maturer years. On the other hand, the increased facilities for self-development afforded by shorter hours, by industrial regulations and by legislation on health and housing, the deepening conviction that knowledge is necessary for the realisation of social and political aspirations, the educational activities, direct and indirect, of organizations which workers have established for themselves, the intellectual interest in finding a reasoned solution of economic problems—all point to an increasing demand for those facilities of study which are needed to build up an educated democracy.

No useful purpose would be served by attempting to distinguish educational institutions according to the preponderance of one or other of the two influences. Both originate in the same recognition of human personality; both may co-exist in the same individual; both aim at the same ideal of a more humane and civilised life. Nor is it wise to deny the title of educational institutions to those agencies which exclusively pursue a narrow partisan aim. They will, in time, widen out into broader studies than they originally contemplated. Education is the best antidote to the dangers it creates. It is the strongest corrective to bias. Knowledge will not be content to remain one-sided; sooner or later it will pursue truth.

The combined effect of these influences will necessarily be to render the environment infinitely more favourable to intellectual interests than it was. Not the least important effect of these and other agencies may be already seen in the changed atmosphere of the home. Generally speaking, it favours the spread of education. Thirty years ago, it was common enough to hear parents say that they did not 'hold with' learning, or that they did not wish their children's heads to be filled with 'fool notions.' That attitude has changed. Education is no longer ridiculed. It is respected by the older generation—mainly on utilitarian grounds. Instead of the scoff, there is regret or envy. 'If,' says the parent of to-day, 'I had had the chance my 'boy has, I should not have stuck where I now am.' And immense and pathetic are the sacrifices that are made to secure for their children that chance.

More rarely perhaps, but not uncommonly, a further stage is reached. The truth that education helps men and women to realise their own personality is recognised. Again and again men may be heard to say 'if I had had education, I should not *be* 'what I am.' It is from this last point that the younger generation starts. They are not contented with the universal provision of elementary education and the selective provision of secondary instruction. They revolt against the tacit assumption that the intellectual, moral and spiritual need of those who work with their hands is different from that of those who work with their brains. They claim their share in the inheritance of the past, as well as in the material wealth of the present and the future. They assert their right to an interest in art and literature,

in science and languages. They are not satisfied that adult education should be the luxury of exceptional persons. They claim that its opportunities are a national necessity, that they should be uniformly spread over the whole community, and that the humane studies must be brought, uniformly and systematically, within reach of those who do not and cannot live within the walls of Universities.

If this demand is to be satisfied, some popular notions of education must be revised. One is the narrow idea which limits it to a period of preparation that is left behind on entering practical life. The word is, by custom, associated only with the painful drudgery and competitive examinations of youth and adolescence. To many the prolongation of its processes to maturer years would be to add a new terror to age, and to rob it of its chief compensation. Yet, to those who have to earn a living when young, and to those whose interest in citizenship is first aroused by the actual exercise of its rights, adult education is the only means by which they can make good the restricted opportunities of youth. A broader conception and a wider definition are therefore needed.

Another example, in present circumstances, will hardly survive its statement. Few people to-day would venture to argue in public that education should be restricted in order that the educated classes might rule the masses. Exclusiveness in matters of instruction is out of date: it is not only obsolete, but incompatible with democratic rule. The half truth that 'a little 'knowledge is a dangerous thing' can no longer impede the removal of ignorance and the stimulation of intellectual curiosity. The only path to national safety and happiness leads, through an educated democracy, to nobler ideals of life, to higher standards of citizenship, and to the more universal recognition of civic responsibilities.

A third example is a more insidious foe to the educational movement, because, up to a point, the popular notion commands universal sympathy. It is the gospel of vocational efficiency. Manual instruction and industrial training are of national importance. They meet an urgent need. They may, admittedly, be made educational instruments of high value. The more closely manual toil can be associated with a study of form and beauty, with a knowledge of the properties of the material

employed, with a perception of the meaning of the task, with a sense of the relation of the parts to the whole, the greater the interest which is imparted to labour, and the greater the dignity which it assumes in the eyes of those who by it have to earn their bread. This is true, and the value of a training in which hand-work and head-work are thus combined, is emphasised by modern tendencies. The division of labour is economically advantageous ; the differentiation of departments and the specialisation of details cheapen production ; but, to the worker himself, they are intellectually deadening. Yet, useful as industrial training of the highest kind undoubtedly is, it leaves a whole world of interest, as well as a great part of human nature, uncultivated. After all, the man is more than the mechanic, and the gospel of vocational efficiency is only an incomplete and partial interpretation of the true mission of education. Within its limits, it must be recognised as a useful and even an essential aim. But there is still a real danger lest technical instruction be made a substitute for a wider intellectual training. There are still those who desire to confine industrial education within narrow limits, who would make it manual, not mental, who would use it to enable men to pursue special trades with greater skill, but not to enable them to do anything else. In their heart of hearts they consider that the community requires its hewers of wood and drawers of water, and by offering only technical instruction, they hope to secure a continuous supply of the class.

The three notions selected for examples of popular ideas which require revision, are tacitly held rather than publicly avowed. That is so much to the good. The three have one point in common. They impose limits on education to the detriment of those who labour with their hands. The first restricts its operations in point of time ; the second and third restrict them in their scope, the one for political, the other for industrial purposes. It is these and similar restrictions that are swept away by the demand for adult education of an University type. What then is the meaning which is attached to the words ? What is the extent of the demand ? Can it be satisfied ?

Education is a word of many shades of meaning, and a process with many purposes. In its widest sense it embraces all the activities, experiences and influences which educate human beings from the cradle to the grave. It includes all the means by which

they are trained to be parents, workers, thinkers and citizens. Even on more modest lines, the scope of adult education is vast. Its mission is to teach men and women to live fuller, deeper, richer, more interesting and useful lives, and its teaching is a life-long process. In any democratic society which aims at any degree of equality, or relies on quickening the social conscience, the need for it is urgent and indeed paramount.

Science reveals to us, at the bottom of the biological scale, organisms which have only the most limited correspondence with their surroundings, and are excluded by their low development from a whole world to which higher forms of life have additional access. So also there are human beings in all grades of society who have only a limited correspondence with their surroundings. Half their natures remain torpid, frozen, dead. They take little or no interest in the history even of their own country ; they are insensible to any true feeling for art ; literature lays on them no binding spell ; they do not respond to the wonder and beauty of the world as they are revealed by science ; they are dulled to the value and significance of life, and to the part they ought to play in it as men and women and as citizens of no mean city. Their imaginations have not been stirred ; their latent interests have never been revealed ; their dormant faculties never awakened. Their horizon remains narrow ; their outlook is confined. Yet to all these people there probably have come moments when they have felt themselves uplifted to a higher plane of thought and feeling than is habitual to them, moments when they have felt the desire and the capacity for something better than their ordinary routine. Such moments are measures of their true selves, revelations of their latent possibilities. But they come more and more rarely, till they cease their visits altogether with the atrophy of the feelings to which they appeal. Imagination, sympathy, the capacity to be inspired by great thoughts or great events, the faculty of unselfish enthusiasm, can be strengthened by use ; they may just as surely be stunted, starved, and destroyed by disuse.

This irresponsiveness, this torpor, this paralysis of higher faculties, are a waste of human material. They are also a danger to the community, especially if it is a democratic society. Against them education is a powerful remedy. But to make it effective, it must not cease with adolescence, and it must not be purely

vocational. It must continue throughout life. In favour of this view, a psychological theory of our mental history affords an interesting argument. The reason why it is so hard to catch and hold the attention of children is that they have so little to attend with. But they have two primitive, rudimentary, native interests. One is their personal selves ; the other is sensation-sights, sounds or motion of a lively or violent kind. Their attention can only be fixed on any new thought or object by borrowing for it an interest from one of these two native interests; by hanging it, however lightly, to one of these two primitive, rudimentary pegs. Here, according to the theory, education begins. The starting point of our mental history is the first association of an acquired with a native interest. Thus, the gradual accretion of interests resembles the formation of a swarm of bees. Layer after layer of insects cling to one another in a cluster, all hanging to the few which grapple with their feet the bough from which the mass depends. The richness and fulness of our subsequent development lie in the range and variety of our acquired interests, and in the degree to which they suffuse and colour our inner lives.

If our educational training stops short at adolescence, the swarm is necessarily meagre. The acquired interests are neither numerous enough nor strong enough to compete with the native interests and the practical necessities of life. Young people do not always respond with readiness to forced learning, or allow its roots to reach their inner lives ; their special aptitudes may not be brought out by the narrow course of school studies ; they may have developed too slowly to profit by the training of their early years. In all these cases the probability is that the ascendency of the two native interests will remain unchallenged.

If, on the other hand, the educational training is purely vocational and strictly utilitarian, it may find docile pupils. It appeals strongly to our native interest in our personal selves, and we are quick to recognise its commercial bearing on our personal advancement. But here again there will be no swarm. The native interest in our personal selves is not merely a peg ; it is the aim and object of the technical training. Acquired interests obtain no independent life ; they exist only for the gratification of the native interest ; they are its ministers, its slaves. The result is that, in adult life, the only thing for which

we profoundly care is our personal fortune, our personal success, our personal position. There is no cluster of acquired interests ; there is only the native interest swollen to a disproportionate size. If we have retained, as most men do, the other native interest in sensation, in sights or sounds or motion, we are back, experience apart, where we were in childhood. Our native interests alone survive : they are concentrated on daily bread, and cinemas or football.

As in childhood, so in adult manhood, it is to one of these rudimentary pegs that new ideas must be hung, if they are to catch and hold our attention. So the British Empire must borrow an interest from the native interest in increased employment derived from increased trade. So the League of Nations must be hung to the peg of the reduction of rates and taxes consequent on disarmament. So industrial problems of vast importance and complexity turn exclusively on questions of so many extra shillings a week. An education which stops short at adolescence, or is purely vocational in its aims, not only starves the development of personality and robs individual lives of their potential fulness. It blunts the social conscience and endangers the common life of the nation.

The nation has embarked on a great democratic experiment. It will not be safe for the world so long as ignorance and materialism stunt and warp individual and national life. Education is needed in the interests both of democracy and of humanity. As human beings, we have our living to make, and education helps us to earn our livelihood. Its vocational value must not be underrated. But practical utility is not enough. In the narrow sense of the word, it is our vocation to be mechanics, or doctors, or lawyers, or manual workers. In the deeper and truer sense of the word, it is also our vocation to be not only citizens of no mean city, but men and women. As citizens we have duties to fulfil towards ourselves and to the community, and any education which is worth the name will train us not only to turn to good account the hours that we spend in the factory or at the desk : it will train us also for the wise and patriotic use of our hours of leisure, and for the purifying and ennobling employment of the time when we are our own masters. We are also men and women with lives to live, and education trains us for a fuller life. ' I am come,' said the greatest of Teachers, ' that they may

'have life and may have it more abundantly.' That, with all reverence be it written, is also the mission of education. It helps us to waste none of our mental and moral resources; it develops our capacities; it draws out our interests; it sets free our faculties, creates our enthusiasm, warms our sympathies and our emotions; it gives us access to some of the highest enjoyments of existence; it enables us to develop our personality; it helps us to rise to our full stature. It teaches us life as workers, as citizens, as men and women. Rightly pursued, it not only quickens our intelligence, but ennobles our nature. It liberates the nation to work out its own destiny.

To these high-sounding generalities the doubter replies with a practical question. Admitting the advantages and even the necessities of a more widely diffused intelligence, is there any persistent and effective craving for adult education on non-vocational lines? It is not always wise to compel supply to wait upon demand. But that argument need not be developed. The demand already exists. In the present century it has rapidly increased in strength; it has found direction; and, though the quantity may still be small, relatively to the total population, there can be no dispute as to its quality. The delicate, ill-fed, overworked child, sent at ten into a cotton factory, who, coming home wearied and exhausted, not only joined a night school, but read far on into the night by the light of saved candle-ends, is now a labour leader and has held high office. His effort is typical of the sacrifices that workers all over the country are making in pursuit of knowledge.

It is unnecessary to dwell in detail on the persistency of the movement for adult education in the nineteenth century. In the first half of the period it was an attempt to give to adults the training which was denied them as children; in the second half, it was an effort to continue and complete the instruction given in childhood. Its story up to 1850 is full of romance. In the adult schools is represented the religious revival, in mechanics' institutes the advance of physical science; the passion of new ideals of social and political freedom inspired the struggles of individuals like Francis Place, William Lovett or Thomas Cooper, and the educational efforts of co-operative societies or the young trade unions. From 1850 onwards the stream expands in force and volume. The activities of adult schools were enlarged and

increased. Co-operative societies continued to uphold, directly and indirectly, the inclusion of humane education among the social aims of democracy. The State made a beginning in the provision of elementary, and subsequently of higher, education. New agencies came into play. The universities, old as well as new, began to take a prominent part as learners as well as teachers, gaining in experience of life from those whom they taught. People's colleges were founded in industrial centres ; university extension lectures were launched ; university institutions multiplied in great cities ; university settlements were established in London and elsewhere. The union of brain-workers and hand-workers in the pursuit of a common ideal had begun.

Educationally, the twentieth century has inaugurated a new era. The State has elaborated its organization of elementary and secondary instruction. It has strengthened its machinery—above, by the establishment of the central authority ; below by the jurisdiction of local authorities. The increased efficiency is striking. Equally significant is the growing interest of the working class in adult education of a non-vocational character. A complete list of the voluntary organizations which exist for its promotion would make too great a demand on space. The bare mention of some of the most important, without repeating those already enumerated, reveals a many-sided effort, the extent of which is seldom realised. Working class organizations like trade unions, co-operative and friendly societies, train their members in administration ; they supply powerful incentives to self-improvement ; they also take a direct part in promoting the educational movement. The Co-operative Union, with a long and honourable record of effort to its credit, has its own director and programme of studies, and has decided to establish a co-operative college. Ruskin College, reorganized, and opened to women, trains the leaders of organized labour. The Plebs League and the Labour College work apart. The Labour College, frankly political and partisan, teaches social science to trade unionists and conducts lecture classes in South Wales and the North. The Society of Friends and the Adult Schools have their home of study at Woodbrooke, and their settlements at York and at Leeds ; Fircroft offers its students, ' in an atmosphere ' of fellowship,' courses of systematic study of a university standard, non-partisan in character, and fourteen residential colleges for adult workers on the same lines are projected.

Both the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association now make adult education a prominent part of their programme ; at Beckenham the latter has a residential college for working women. Settlements of the type of Toynbee Hall have multiplied in industrial centres. Similar institutions have developed, on non-residential lines, at Beechcroft and at Lemington-on-Tyne, which focus the adult educational efforts of their respective districts. Summer schools, week-end schools, study-circles, clubs and institutes spread a network of instruction over wide areas. Many organizations, whose objects are primarily religious, conduct lectures and classes in secular subjects, especially on social welfare. Dramatic, musical, literary, scientific, philosophical, naturalist and photographic societies enrol among their members many adult workers. The newest and, while it lasted, the most powerful of educational agencies for adults, has indeed ceased its immense operations.

The marvellous improvisation, which changed the military camps behind the lines and elsewhere into centres of instruction, humane and civic as well as vocational, was one of the great achievements of the war. Its effect is lasting—in the experience gained, in the proof afforded of a wide-spread demand, in the work done, in the desire of thousands of discharged soldiers to complete their interrupted instruction.

The most promising of twentieth century experiments in the non-vocational education of adults remains to be mentioned. In 1903 the Workers' Educational Association came into existence, as a development and adaptation of the older extension movement, and a complementary part of the extra-mural work of the universities. It owed much of its immediate success to the enthusiasm and magnetic influence of the founder, Mr. Mansbridge, and his wife. But its solid strength is derived from the accuracy with which it interprets the educational needs and wishes of workers, and the closeness with which it is woven into the texture of their everyday life. Himself a co-operator, a firm believer in trade unionism, and an ardent extension student, Mr. Mansbridge knew from his own experience the value of the combination of the three principles. He aimed at uniting scholars and workers, on democratic lines, in a co-operative enterprise for the joint pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, each contributing to the common stock, scholars from their

intellectual training and traditions, workers from their first-hand familiarity with the realities of life. He recognised that in the united effort of the search for truth and for the means of fuller life, might be rooted the vital solidarity of working class and university organizations, to the vast enrichment of both. In this spirit the Workers' Educational Association was launched, and the tutorial classes, through which it works, are conducted. Thus, in one essential particular, the association is at present sharply divided from the Plebs League and the Labour College. It accepts the co-operation of universities and other educational bodies, which they reject as instruments of the old order.

It is a federation both for the creation of a demand for adult education of the university type, and for the organization of its supply. On both sides it has succeeded. It embodies, with the exceptions previously noted, the educational policy of organized labour. To it are affiliated the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress, the Co-operative Union, Ruskin College, the Working Men's Club and Institute Union, and many other trade union and co-operative bodies. On the other side it has the support of the Board of Education, of many local education authorities, and of all the universities and university colleges in England and Wales. It has met with a similar response in Scotland, in Ireland, in the Overseas Dominions, on the Continent of Europe and in North America. In the detailed direction of the movement the bodies of labour and of learning exercise joint and equal control. The fullest freedom is secured to students in the choice of subjects, time and teachers. Tutorial classes of those interested and especially of working men and women, each limited in number to thirty, are formed on the spontaneous expression of their wish to learn. They undertake, under the guidance of a tutor, nominated by the joint committee and appointed by a university, to study some subject on academic lines for a definite period, usually three years, to attend regularly, two hours at a time, and to do a fixed quantity of written work. The favourite subjects are economic or social and industrial history, English literature, philosophy and psychology, and modern European history. The attendances at the lecture, and the class which follows, are remarkably regular ; the standard of the written work, though necessarily variable, reaches at its best that of a high degree in honours. Scattered

over the country, thousands of students are already at work in these classes. There are the stirrings of a new intellectual renaissance. If a twentieth century Erasmus visited England to trace its progress, he would be taken to the potteries, where Longton is the centre of a widening circle of students.

The demand by workers for adult education on university lines is one of the most hopeful signs of the times. The co-operation of labour and learning in the pursuit of truth means the readiness to face facts, to suspend judgment till reasonable certainty is available, to court the spirit of enquiry, to accept fair criticism, to tolerate differences of opinion. Some of the finest passages of Greek literature deal with the remorselessness of fate which dooms one man to unmerited suffering, and drives another to commit the crime that he abhors. Confronted by the similar problem which is presented by the laws of heredity and environment, we can only face the future in a more hopeful attitude because we know that those laws can be modified. Every ennobling pursuit that occupies our minds, every elevating interest by which we are inspired, every advance that we make in self-improvement, every approach that we make to our full stature as men and women and as citizens, is improving the conditions of life for ourselves, for those among whom we live, and for our successors. Multiply a thousandfold the honest searchers after truth, and the great democratic experiment on which the nation has embarked will be a thousand times safer for Great Britain and the world.

ERNLE.

CAPITALISM

III.

IN the previous article on this subject* it was shown that the development of Capitalism during the last century had not followed the course anticipated by the Marxian hypothesis, which postulates the progressive concentration of capital in ever fewer hands with increasing misery of the masses and of the economic contrast which divides society into two hostile classes. Instead of this there has been a great increase in the number of capitalists, and a great diffusion of wealth; the provision of innumerable comforts, conveniences and amenities at the disposal of all classes; a great improvement in the conditions of life for the masses, shown in the progressive decline of pauperism and death-rates; and a corresponding approximation towards social equality.

Sir Josiah Stamp has recently thrown the light of a statistical examination of incomes on the question. He found that in this country the average income of all classes in 1914 was twice what it had been in 1801 and that the £1 had twice the purchasing power, so that all classes were four times as well off in real comforts and commodities and the standard of living was four times as good as it was 120 years ago. The comment of a socialist paper on these facts was that productive capacity had increased a great deal more than four times. The writer forgot that the population had also increased four-fold. The net economic result of a century of modern capitalism in this country, where it has had the longest run, is that it has enabled four times as many persons to live four times as well as a hundred years ago. If more life is the final object, then we have it; if a higher material standard of life, then we have that too.

And yet the campaign against capitalism was never so widespread and determined as it is now, in spite of these results. There must be some reason for this, some real reason. It cannot be attributed to the mere gramophone repetition of old phrases and formulas which are negatived by the facts. Such repetition is

---

* EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1921.

assiduously carried on by those who need arguments to sustain the cause they have at heart and who have to use old ones because they cannot think of new ones for themselves. But the arguments do not account for the cause, which has its roots much deeper in feeling and impulse. If it depended on them it would have perished long ago. It is, indeed, the vitality of the cause which has kept alive arguments that seem to support it, not the other way about. For there really is a cause, which continually re-asserts itself. To deny it all validity and attribute it entirely to perverted ideas or erroneous theories or illegitimate desires or base passions is to miss the point. These may play a part, as in other human affairs, but they are not the essential thing.

The truth is that the very success of capitalism indicated above has thrown into stronger relief its failures and defects. This common result of improvements is noted by Herbert Spencer in his essay on Liberty. ' The more things improve,' he says, ' the louder become exclamations about their badness.' Housing, sanitation, public health, intemperance and education illustrate this experience. It is not the evils or defects that are new and growing, as people commonly suppose, but the consciousness of them, which becomes more and more acute as that which excites it diminishes. Take dirt for instance. The cleaner people become the more intolerable is dirt to them, and their susceptibility rises as their exposure to it falls. It is the cleanest house-wife who makes the most fuss about the smallest speck of dirt ; it is the person least in need of washing who insists most anxiously upon it, and painfully resents a deprivation imperceptible to those who need it more. As the appetite grows by what it feeds on, so the standard rises with achievement.

Housing presents a specially instructive example of this psychological process, because bad housing is one of the stock charges against capitalism, which is credited with the creation of ' slums.' It is certainly responsible for the great enlargement and multiplication of towns, rendered necessary by the increase of population, and for defilement of the air by smoke and of running streams by factory refuse. But as for slums, before the development of capitalism the towns were nothing else ; and that is why no fuss was made about them. The conception of the non-slum town had not arisen. It came, in fact, with modern capitalism.

Dr. Aikin's description of Manchester and the neighbouring districts, written in 1795, when power-machine manufacture was rapidly developing there, contains an account of the old housing and of the new, then in progress. There were still standing 'nearly whole streets of houses built of wood, clay and plaster,' and he refers to 'the closeness with which the poor were crowded 'in offensive, dark, damp and incommodious habitations.' These were the old houses in the centre of the town. In contrast with them the new streets nearly doubled the size of the town and 'most of them were wide and spacious, with excellent and 'large houses, principally of brick.' They were a great advance on the old and led to other improvements. For at this period, when we are given to understand the creation of slums began, 'very few streets were paved and walking in them very disagree-'able,' especially at night, as there was little lighting and sometimes none at all. An Act for paving and lighting towns had not long been passed, but as the town was in debt it was not acted on until money had accumulated. If we add to the unpaved and unlighted streets, with their houses of wood, clay and plaster, the absence of drainage, of refuse disposal and of water laid on, we can form some idea of the state of towns before the supposed advent of slums.

Not long before Dr. Aikin wrote, a report had been presented to the town committee for the regulation of police by a Dr. Ferriar, who drew attention to the prevalence of fevers, the spread of infection, cellar dwellings and over-crowding. An Act for widening streets in the centre of the town had been passed in 1776 and the effects were very advantageous as far as they went; 'but still, *as in almost all other old towns*, the central parts are too 'close; and it is only in the more modern streets that elegance 'and convenience are to be found.'

The modern streets of that day, with their elegance and convenience, are the Manchester slums of to-day. There has been a record of progressive improvement and with it a continually rising standard.* The corollary is a rising outcry against a diminishing evil. It is now often said, not that our towns contain

* Readers interested in this subject will find more evidence in the EDINBURGH REVIEW for January, 1918—'Town Life, New and Old.'

slums, but that the bulk of the population live in slums and that the manufacturing towns consist of nothing else. Persons who say this do not know the towns and cannot tell a slum when they see one or name the conditions that constitute slumdom. If they did they would be aware that the worst slums are not in manufacturing towns at all but in sea-ports, small and old country towns and even villages. They would know that a grimy, mean and monotonous exterior does not constitute a slum and that fresh paint and picturesqueness may well conceal one. Many of our manufacturing towns are, in fact, exceptionally free from real slums and some have none at all. But removal of the worst defects heightens consciousness of those that remain ; and just as the conquest of a high peak spurs the mountaineer to attack the one beyond and the higher he mounts the keener his ambition, so the attainment of a superior standard of housing stimulates the pursuit of a fresh ideal.

This psychology has a general application and goes far to explain the apparently paradoxical fact that the material and social uplift of the wage-earners under capitalism has been accompanied or followed by an intensified campaign against capitalism. What has been gained quickens consciousness of what is still to gain, and relief from some burdens heightens the irksomeness of those that remain. It has been observed of the passion of envy by several thinkers—Mandeville, de Tocqueville, Hume—that its intensity increases with proximity and diminishes with distance. The spectacle of a man with a carriage and six horses, says Mandeville, excites more violent envy in one with a carriage and four horses than in one with no carriage at all. The social and financial climber resembles the mountaineer ; his ambition rises with him. This is a factor in the problem, which is generally ignored ; but there are others more worthy of respect. Envy, the basest of passions, does not play a great part with the wage-earners, though social revolutionaries do their utmost to excite it. The motive is rather self-respect, which is quickened by a rising status, and is less concerned with relative than with positive social conditions. And modern economic developments have been accompanied by some effects which counteract the gains achieved. There are positive disadvantages as well as the negative one of imperfectly realized gains, and both are thrown into greater prominence by the improved conditions of life already secured.

What are these existing disabilities and causes of revolt ?

They fall into two categories, one pertaining to the economic position of wage-earners, the other to their personality. The first is objective, a matter of material well-being ; the second is subjective, a matter of dignity and liberty.

The French are past masters in the art of coining phrases which summarize current ideas, and the motto of the *Confédération Générale du Travail* succinctly formulates the two ideas just mentioned. It is *Bien-être et Liberté*, a very significant phrase, though ignored by writers on Syndicalism.* All desire both of these goods, but some give precedence to one and some to the other. This is one of the underlying differences between the socialist and anarchist schools of revolutionary thought. The former have well-being, the latter liberty, primarily in view, and there comes a point at which they inevitably clash, because they ultimately appeal to antithetical principles in human nature, the one to the social, the other to the individual side of man. Well-being can be achieved only in association, but association involves a restriction of individual liberty. This antinomy is a particular form of the Kantian contradiction between free will and the necessity imposed by environment. It presents that speculative antinomy in the form of a practical problem, which is always coming up for solution. The only complete solution is that offered by the Gospel rule, which fuses ' self-love and social ' into perfect unison. Both socialist and anarchist schemes ultimately rely upon this for their working success. The latter assume its voluntary adoption and operation by mankind, at present denied the opportunity by the existing order ; the former look to its development by the system of compulsory control they propose to set up, whatever that may be. Anarchism presupposes that human nature is essentially good and needs only to be let alone ; Socialism that it can be changed and made good by Act of Parliament, as Mr. Sidney Webb was driven by a Socratic examination to assert at the Sankey Coal Inquiry. Goodness is a necessary condition for the successful working of either or any other ideal scheme, and all the Utopias will be found on examination to depend on a tacit assumption of its sway.

---

* For further observations on this subject see the EDINBURGH REVIEW for April, 1919, p. 241.

The fallacy is obvious. The absence of this moral quality in human nature is the cause of all the trouble. Otherwise the condemned ' system ' would never have come into being ; for it was created by man himself and no one else. If men were indeed good the system must needs be good too, for it is the expression of their will and nothing else whatever. Nor can goodness be imposed on them by compulsion. The most that can be done by Act of Parliament is to encourage it by providing a favourable environment and discourage its opposite by restraining gross violations. But the real spring of conduct is within and beyond the reach of compulsion, which men can always manage to evade or defy. The saying, which has been so frequently heard of late, that what is needed is a new heart or a new spirit, recognizes this truth. If it could be realized it would do more than all the Acts of Parliament ever passed and all the systems ever invented. It would evolve its own system and effect a new harmony of the social and individual impulses in human nature, which will produce the desired combination of well-being and liberty. The first step towards it is to have a clear perception of what is amiss with the present order, not only on the surface, but in its inner character ; and we may gain some light by putting it in a historical setting.

History presents us with a succession of attempts to solve the problem by a series of compromises, in which the two principles alternately take precedence as each is carried to excess and has to be corrected. Restriction of individual liberty by authority is necessary to keep society together and prevent men from destroying each other. This was the theme of Hobbes in ' The ' Leviathan.' It was recognised in the economic sphere by the Fathers of the Church and by the schoolmen in the Middle Ages as the practical bar to Communism. But on the other hand all movement depends on liberty. Initiative is necessarily individual, because it is the quality and function of pioneers, leaders of the herd, who are individuals ; and it is suffocated by authority in proportion to the rigidity of the restriction imposed. The consequence of excessive restriction is stagnation until the suppressed impulse re-asserts itself and bursts its bonds. Sooner or later, therefore, either principle, carried too far, provokes a re-action ; and it always tends to be carried too far through the herd instinct of proceeding in a given direction.

It is not possible within the compass of a short essay to show the working of this process in detail. A few broad points must suffice. In the Middle Ages authority was needed to establish some sort of order out of the antecedent chaos of universal strife that followed the break-up of the Roman *imperium ;* and the feudal system was evolved. It did not consist of castles, barons and serfs, as is popularly supposed. They were part of it and a prominent part, because organisation had to be carried out on a local basis in the scattered state of the population and the lack of communications, because strong defences were needed in turbulent times and because agriculture was the chief economic activity. But the feudal system was far more. It was, in effect, a system of universal licensing, of rights and obligations, laid down by authority and embodied in mutual contracts, as the name *foedus* implies. The town corporations and guilds were part of it, as were the Church and the Crown.

It became more and more oppressive and suffocated enterprise. The distinguished Belgian historian, Professor Pirenne, has shown very clearly, in his essay on ' *Les Périodes de l'Histoire* ' *Sociale du Capitalisme*,' the working of liberty and restriction on economic activity in the earlier and later Middle Ages, while at the same time furnishing much detailed evidence in support of the argument advanced in the first of these articles,* that Capitalism was developed in the Middle Ages centuries before the period usually assigned to it.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries free trade was carried on so actively and successfully by private enterprise outside all regulations that men starting from nothing became rich. The classical example is St. Godric, who was the son of poor Lincolnshire peasants, born towards the end of the eleventh century. He first made a living as a beach-comber, prowling for wreckage. Then he acquired a pedlar's pack and wandered from place to place with so much success that presently he took partners, chartered a boat and engaged in coast-wise trade on the shores of England, Scotland, Flanders and Denmark, buying goods in one place where they were plentiful and cheap and selling them in another where they were scarce and dear—the immemorial method of amassing wealth by honest trade. In sixteen years he

---

* Edinburgh Review, July, 1920.

amassed a fortune—*maximas opum divitias in sudore vultus sui sibi perquisierat*—retired from business and died in the odour of sanctity.

It was by free trade that the towns of Italy and Flanders became wealthy at this period. Except for the local dues there were no restrictive regulations ; but this very liberty eventually caused them to be imposed as a defence against competition. One municipality after another put them up and multiplied them until liberty disappeared. Restrictions on external trade involved restrictions on industry for export and by logical extension on all trade and industry. Everything was eventually regulated, to prevent men from cheating and oppressing each other, according to the principles, based on ethical grounds, laid down by the authority of the Church.

There followed a period of routine and stagnation—a lingering process of decline—in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, which again gave place to a new re-assertion of liberty in economic life and a new phase of enterprise, parallel with liberty of conscience, of intellectual culture and research. Intense activity was rapidly developed in every field, leading up to the splendid efflorescence of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. Economic activity reached its height in the German Hanse town, the revival of the Italian cities and the merchant adventurers. But again the violence of competition led to the imposition of restrictions, this time of a different order and on a larger scale than in the thirteenth century. Nations had meanwhile become consolidated and national economy had replaced municipal. The social unit to be protected had expanded. ' Just as the liberty ' of the eleventh and twelfth centuries,' says Professor Pirenne, ' had been succeeded by the control of urban economy, so in ' the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries mercantilism imposed ' itself on commerce and industry.'

The next swing of the pendulum ushered in the present era with the conscious assertion of individual liberty and private enterprise against the principle of control ; and again this was part of a general emancipating movement. To see why the principle of *laissez faire* was brought forward in the eighteenth century, we must study the men who championed it. The notion prevalent to-day among opponents of private enterprise is that its advocates were inspired by Capitalism and acted in the interest

of capitalists. Nothing could be further from the truth. They appeared in France because there the need of emancipation from the shackles of authority of every kind was greatest. French thought in the eighteenth century is one long rising cry against authority of every kind, political, religious, intellectual, social and economic. The ' physiocrats ' represented the last field, though that designation might have been equally applied to the moralists and men of science, for all alike insisted on reverting to the laws of nature in revolt against the artificial laws of human authority.

The so-called physiocrats, who insisted on the principle of *laissez faire* in economics and inspired Adam Smith, were essentially reformers. They were men of lofty and disinterested character, counsellors, administrators and thinkers. Quesnay, the founder of the school, was a physician who began life in a humble sphere but rose by sheer merit to a position of great influence with the King, though he was no courtier but singularly independent and out-spoken. The wretched condition of the poor, and particularly the peasantry, constantly occupied his thoughts, and he took for the motto of his *Tableau Économique* published in 1758—*Pauvres paysans, pauvre royaume ; pauvre royaume, pauvre Roi.* Turgot, the most influential of all, and de Gournay, his friend, held high administrative office in the service of the State, and both spent themselves in using their position to effect reforms for relief of the most oppressed sections of the population. Mercier de la Rivière was another public servant. Baudeau, who invented the term ' physiocrat,' was an abbé ; Letrosne and Dupont de Nemours were publicists. These are the chief names in the school. Letrosne and de la Rivière were the most systematic economists, but the great object of all was reform.

The artificial control of trade and industry under Colbert, in accordance with the mercantile theory of exports and imports, had been carried to great lengths in France ; and being tacked on to some relics of feudal custom—feudalism proper had long since given place to monarchist or ministerial autocracy—had reduced the rural population, which formed the bulk of the people, to a state of intolerable misery. Prohibition of the export of corn deprived them of their most lucrative market ; and at the same time moderate taxation in the towns to encourage industries

for export was made good by heavier burdens on agriculture, while the general policy of fostering urban industries drew away capital and energy to the towns. Control was over-done ; the country was declining, not rising ; and the physiocrats perceived it. Their remedy was complete liberty ; let trade and industry follow their natural course. The actual phrase *laissez faire, laissez passer* has been attributed to both Le Gendre and d'Argenson in reply to Colbert, but Colbert seems himself to have adopted it, according to a passage quoted by Lord Acton, from the *Comptes Rendus de l'Institut. La liberté est l'âme du commerce. Il faut laisser faire les hommes qui s'appliquent sans peine à ce qui convient le mieux.*

At any rate the physiocrats were the men who proclaimed and spread this doctrine, not in the interest of capital and property, but on behalf of consumers generally and of the wretched and oppressed in particular. No doubt they put it too high in their re-action against arbitrary control, but reformers always do that ; substantially they were right ; the time had come for the pendulum to swing back once more, and it did. Here in England, too, the time was ripe. A century earlier Josiah Child had struck a blow at the restraint on domestic trade ; the Whig régime and the development of Nonconformity had fostered the idea of liberty ; and the travail of inventive genius, slowly maturing from its beginnings in the Middle Ages, was ready to bring forth its prodigious offspring. The ground was fully prepared when Adam Smith, who had foregathered with Turgot in 1764, launched his famous classic in 1776.

The acceptance and application of the doctrine of freedom for trade and industry and the immense expansion of both that followed, are too familiar to need recounting. There never was free trade between the nations, but the individual principle was once more in the ascendant and allowed freer play than ever before. The result was modern Capitalism, and just as its development was unprecedentedly rapid, so the beginnings of re-action against it were quick to set in. The new powers were so vast and the changes wrought by them so great that the ill effects of unrestricted competition began to appear at a very early stage and could not be hidden. The social principle promptly re-asserted itself a century ago and the conflict between the two has continued ever since. The result has been a gradual modifi-

cation of the balance struck at the beginning of the fourteenth century, which put the individual principle too high.

Now the effect of individual liberty is always inequality, because it allows free play to the natural inequality which exists among men, as throughout the whole realm of Nature ; for no two gnats and no two blades of grass are perfectly equal. Among men the strong and capable emerge from the rest and obtain ascendancy in proportion to the freedom of action allowed them. Bodily strength and address are the qualities that obtain ascendance in the earliest forms of society and in primitive warfare. Later, intellectual ability, which takes many forms, plays the same part. In the economic field it is a particular form of intelligence, as Pirenne remarks of St. Godric, and Hansen of the rise of the bourgeoisie (*Die drei Bevölkerungsstufen*). Intelligence combined with industry and thrift. It is not that they are more acquisitive than most of their neighbours, who would do the same if they knew how ; it is that the men who succeed do know how. Such men become rich and gain power and influence. And they are always new men, who surge up in every epoch of free enterprise. They are parvenus, *nouveaux riches*.

This is a very important fact on which Pirenne lays great stress. He shows that in each period of renewed activity—the early Middle Ages, the Renaissance and our own era—the agents were not the already rich and powerful, who had retired to a more leisurely life, entrenched in privilege, and were more concerned to maintain the *status quo* than to push new enterprise. They were men of initiative and energy, who came up from below. There was no continuity, as is commonly assumed, but on the contrary a series of breaks and fresh starts. This is conspicuously the case with the modern development that began in the eighteenth century. The pioneers and builders of machine-power industry were chiefly workmen of exceptional energy and intelligence.* They were not merchant princes and rich capitalists, but ' self-made ' men. Marx did not know this because he never inquired ; his picture of the typical employer as ' Mr Moneybags ' is drawn from imagination not from life. The typical man was a workman who saved or borrowed a little

* The writer has drawn attention to this in his ' Industrial Efficiency,' edition of 1909, p. 533.

capital and started in a small way. A famous cotton concern—Crewdsons—which was sold in 1919 for £5,000,000, is a typical case. It was started in 1768 by an ordinary workman who got together a few spindles. The origin of at least nineteen out of twenty of the manufacturing concerns, which developed so quickly at this period, was similar.*

Several consequences followed. Such exceptional workmen were hard men ; they worked hard themselves and worked others hard. And conscious of their own superior capacity they looked down on their fellows, who lacked it. Tremendous power was placed in their hands by the new inventions and methods of manufacture—power to amass wealth and to dominate those whom they employed ; and they used it to the full. They were in a position to grow rich and to oppress and they did both. The revolutionary journal, *The Poor Man's Guardian*, bore witness to it in 1831 :—

' How many individuals have been known to raise themselves from the lowest walks of life to the greatest heights of affluence, rank and station in society ; yet it is invariably the case that such men are greater tyrants and oppressors of that class from which they sprang than those who were born in affluence.'†

Not the old ' bourgeoisie,' but the ' proletariate,' furnished the new capitalists and oppressors. The result was a state of extreme inequality between men belonging to the same social grade, which made the contrast more glaring. And extreme inequality is inimical to the social instinct. It was a double inequality, economic and personal. Not only did the successful master grow rich while his men remained poor and at times grew poorer ; but in his eyes they were inferior creatures, poor devils only fit to be ordered about, to be taken on and cast off at pleasure. Had not he created the business by his superior brains and toil.

At first this inferior status was but little resented by the men themselves because they recognised the superior capacity of the

---

* ' Almost without exception the millionaire capitalists of this country and America have been men who rose from the ranks of the working class.'—*The Meaning of Socialism*, by J. Bruce Glasier, 1919.

† The Amalgamated Society of Engineers in its annual report for 1855 made the same observation of its own members who had become employers ; they ' conducted the workshops even worse than the employers.'

master, and as they always got as much as they could themselves it seemed natural that he should do the same. This feeling is reflected in an anecdote told in the *Cotton Factory Times* a few years ago, of a man who had risen from mill-worker to mill-owner. His workmen wanted a rise of wage, and sent a deputation, who reminded him that when he was a workman he always tried to get as much out of other people as he could. 'Yes,' he replied, 'and you ought to know that I haven't altered yet.' The deputation accepted defeat and retired.

It was among benevolent lookers-on that revolt against the 'system' began, and led to the rise of Socialism, which represented an extreme view and aimed, not at remedying the defects of the 'system,' but at abolishing it. But the workmen too were driven to revolt on their own account; for conditions became harder instead of easier. On the economic side the growing intensity of commercial competition accentuated the standing struggle for the maintenance of wages, and the periodical recurrence of bad trade and unemployment negatived such success as the workmen attained; their position became less secure while the gains of employers increased. At the same time the enlargement of the industrial apparatus and of the capital needed to create it put the prospect of becoming employers further out of reach. The gulf widened and deepened. The early critics of free enterprise, from whom Marx took this side of his exposition, were right in insisting on these and associated phenomena. But they missed the personal side, which is still more important.

The increased magnitude of establishments and of the number of persons employed necessitated corresponding organization and a hierarchy in which the veritable employer disappeared from view at the far end. Along with this went a stricter discipline and a more minute division of labour, which tended to reduce the workman to a mere cog and to depreciate his personality. And the power-machine became a more and more inexorable tyrant. There was no escape from it, and as it was speeded up by technical improvements an ever more tense and unremitting attention was needed to feed its remorseless jaws. The men who fed it were on a treadmill, which kept them incessantly moving without respite and without their own volition. They could not pause for a moment if they felt inclined and get a little relief, as in earlier modes of manufacture; the infernal

regularity of the machine prevented any such relaxation of the strained attention. These were the great changes effected in working conditions—the hierarchy, the loss of personality and the treadmill.

Their bearing was not perceived ; nor is it fully understood now. The early criticisms of the new industrial order were directed almost entirely to its economic effects. Sismondi, who accurately noted the developments of the manufacturing process, interpreted them as enhancing the gains of the employer and diminishing the share of the employed. Marx, who repeated his observations, took the same line. These changes were in his eyes the means of extracting more surplus value from labour, which is the essence of the capitalist system of production according to his analysis. And it is chiefly to the economic or at least the material side of the problem that attention has been directed alike by workmen, reformers and the legislature. Even the right to combine, which is a matter of liberty, and the later concessions to trade unions, have been granted with a view to ' collective ' bargaining and explicitly for the purpose of improving material conditions.

In short *bien-être* has been the great object. The changes enumerated in the previous article, which have falsified the prediction of increasing misery, have all gone to increase *bien-être*. In this field the social principle has asserted itself and restrained the abuse of power placed in the hands of particular persons by the conquest of nature. They have not been allowed the free play demanded by the theory of *laissez faire*, but have been subjected to a gradual process of cumulative restriction. Wealth has been more evenly spread, as the total has increased, both directly by a fairer balance of bargaining power between employers and employed, and indirectly by the provision of many public services, paid for by taxation which extracts a proportionately larger share from the rich. But there still remains great economic inequality which excites the more dissatisfaction because of the advances made, on the principle already explained.

On the personal side the case is different. There has been a great advance in political and legal freedom ; but this, together with the higher standard of living, only throws into deeper relief the subjection imposed by the organization of industry, which has rather increased than diminished. A man's personality

counts for rather less than ever and is less regarded in the workshop, while it has gained recognition in one field after another outside. The contrast is glaring and is more acutely felt as each generation comes on equipped with better education, and conscious of higher ambitions, with larger opportunities opening before it in public and private life.

This is the great positive defect of Capitalism. The cry, growing in persistence and urgency, for a ' voice in the manage- ' ment,' is really a demand for the recognition of the rank and file as intelligent human beings with some volition of their own. It is not only a legitimate, but a laudable aspiration, and it is perfectly compatible with private enterprise ; more compatible, indeed, than with public ownership and control in which the hierarchy is more rigid and crushing. A hierarchy there must be under any system, but it need not be crushing. What is really amiss is a failure to recognise the true character of industrial concerns and the relation of the several contributory factors, of which labour is one.

The root of it lies in the conception of labour as something bought by a capitalist. Ricardo, the evil genius of economics, stereotyped this notion, and Marx made it no better by his great discovery that it is not labour but labour power that is bought and sold. The idea of sale is altogether wrong, and Marx's great discovery is a great mare's nest. The essence of a sale is that the thing sold passes entirely out of the possession of the seller into that of the buyer ; but labour power is a man's capacity to work, which is inseparable from his person. He cannot sell it or part with it. If he sells anything it is the use of it ; and labour power in use, says Marx, is labour. But he does not even sell the use of it, for he only can use it ; he must apply it himself, and if he chooses to ca' canny the employer does not get it.

What he really does is to put his capital into the concern. His capacity is his capital in the proper sense of the word, as explained in the first of these articles. He is actually a partner in a co-operative undertaking or *societas*, as it was called in the Middle Ages. The position is seen most clearly in the simplest form of combination which is that of a private partnership. Each man puts in his capital ; it may be money or experience or particular knowledge or business connexions or mere labour. They share the proceeds by agreement, though not equally ;

there are senior and junior partners. But they are all treated personally as partners.

It is impossible to follow out this idea in the present essay. It must suffice to suggest that the conception of wage-earners as actually partners in a co-operative concern and entitled to the treatment of partners entirely alters their status and puts the whole problem in a different light. On the economic side of the problem we have said above that great inequality still remains. It is, indeed, too great; there is something repugnant about it. No one can look round and honestly observe the actual contrast without feeling this. But when one comes to look closely into the mechanism of the creation and distribution of wealth it is very difficult to lay one's finger on the point where injustice comes in and an effective remedy can be applied without causing some other injustice or damaging the whole structure to the disadvantage of all. Even the principle of inheritance, whereby a worthless and noxious person, who does nothing but harm to the community, may draw the greatest material benefits from it, is very difficult to deal with. It has its roots in natural affection, which is the bed-rock foundation of the social virtues, and cannot be antagonized without injuring them. To eliminate it is impossible and so great is its tenacity that it will always find a way to assert itself and evade too drastic repression. Its ill effects are best corrected by taxation. Apart from this the distribution of wealth goes far more by the value of services rendered, in the estimation of the community, and is therefore less unjust, than appears on the surface.

The great gains do not go to the capitalist as such. They go to the mental capital thrown into the enterprise and particularly to the planning, organizing and guiding brain at the head of it, which makes all the difference between success and failure. It is this function that Marx ignored. He makes a few perfunctory references to supervision and inspection, which are subordinate functions, but ignores the supreme faculty which organizes and conducts the whole. It is a creative faculty which cannot work in shackles. To stifle it is to kill life and movement and fall back on routine. That is the direction in which we are moving now; the pendulum is swinging right back.

A. Shadwell.

THE NEW PROTECTION

THERE is grave reason to fear that the country is about to witness the revival in an acute form of the old fiscal controversy. It is an unpleasant prospect. We can find enough material for bitter disputes with one another in the new problems now before us without raking among the embers of a fire that had burnt itself out. The harm done by the past fiscal controversy cannot easily be over-estimated. That controversy split the Unionist Party from top to toe, and rendered it powerless to oppose changes in the constitution of the United Kingdom for which the country may yet have to pay even more dearly than it has paid already. A renewal of the controversy may possibly produce even greater mischief. At the present time it is a matter of supreme national importance that the sober forces of the nation should be united to resist social revolution. Yet it is certain that if the fiscal controversy is revived, those forces will be divided.

In form the new schemes for defending what are called key industries and for countervailing low rates of exchange differ substantially from the proposals which were the basis of the ' raging, tearing propaganda ' of 1903. Those earlier proposals contemplated the establishment of a definite customs tariff upon imports. The provisions of that tariff, after they had been debated in detail in committee of the House of Commons, would have been embodied in an Act of Parliament and would have continued in operation until repealed or altered by a fresh Act. On that method, which is the method almost invariably followed by countries which are openly protectionist, our manufacturers and traders would have known exactly where they stood, and would have been able to make definite arrangements—in some cases for exploiting to the utmost the favours which Parliament had conferred upon them ; in other cases for trying to overcome the difficulties which the same authority had imposed upon their industry. Instead of this method, which at least has the merit that its provisions are publicly known and cannot be altered without a fresh Act of Parliament, the new protectionists

propose a scheme which would leave the fate of a large number of our industries entirely in the hands of government officials.

It is true that the latest proposals of the government as set forth in the Ways and Means Resolutions before the House of Commons do specify definite categories of articles which are to be taxed at a definite rate, and to this extent the practice of the older protectionists is followed. Even here, however, there is a very dangerous new departure. This list of so-called key industries comprises nine separate categories set forth in more or less precise terms. But the resolution goes on to state that the proposed tariff shall also apply to ' any articles comprised in ' any list which may from time to time be issued by the Board ' of Trade for defining the articles which are to be taken as ' falling under any of the general descriptions set out above.' That is to say that the interpretation of an Act of Parliament is to be left, not to the King's judges sitting in open court, but to the officials of the Board of Trade sitting behind closed doors.

In the second and more important of the two resolutions there is not even pretence of preserving the old constitutional safeguards for the liberty of the subject. This resolution provides that the Board of Trade may issue orders subjecting ' articles of any class or description ' to a duty of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. *ad valorem* on the ground that such goods

> ' are being sold or offered for sale in the United Kingdom—
> (a) At prices below the cost of production thereof ; or
> (b) At prices which, by reason of depreciation in the value in relation to sterling of the currency of the country in which the goods are manufactured, are below the prices at which similar goods can be profitably manufactured in the United Kingdom ;
> and that by reason thereof employment in any industry in the United Kingdom is being or is likely to be seriously affected.

Thus it will rest with the officials of that department, first to decide whether employment in any industry is being seriously affected by the importation complained of ; secondly, to ascertain in case (a) what is the cost of production of the goods in the country of origin, or in case (b) what is the price at which similar goods could be profitably manufactured in the United Kingdom. Needless to say this means an enormous increase in the staff of

the Board of Trade. Officials would have to be sent to every country in the world to enquire into wholesale prices at every factory concerned ; other officials would have to be employed at home to investigate the costs of production in industries claiming protection.

A scheme so totally at variance with the traditions of constitutional liberty in this country would before the war have found no support whatever. But during the war conditions were created which rendered politically possible the launching of such a scheme. In the first place the overwhelming necessities of national defence imposed upon the government during the war the duty of regulating the trade of the country from the point of view of efficiency in war without regard to efficiency in commerce. The loss of valuable contracts was a small matter compared with the loss of battleships or battles. Entrusted with these absolute powers, our officials and our politicians acquired an arrogance of temperament utterly at variance with all the traditions of the government of a free country. They assumed that they were infallible pontiffs ; that from their sheltered nests in the castles of Whitehall they could determine all the details of every industry in the country ; and that the whole duty of mere common citizens throughout the kingdom was to obey whatever orders they chose to issue.

Naturally men who had acquired this temperament during the war were reluctant to surrender their powers after the war. For more than a year after fighting ceased government officials continued to control the importation of goods into this country by arbitrary edicts, boldly claiming that they were empowered so to do by Acts of Parliament which had been passed in 1853 and 1876 for the declared purpose of establishing complete freedom of overseas trading. Each of these Acts contained the following clause legalising one exception to the general principles of freedom of trade which they laid down :—

> ' The importation of arms, ammunition, gunpowder or any other goods may be prohibited by Proclamation or Order in Council.'

The purpose of this clause is sufficiently obvious. It was intended to give power to the executive government to prohibit the importation of any goods in the nature of arms or ammunition. Yet throughout the year 1919 the officials of the Board of Trade claimed that this clause gave them power to prohibit the

importation of any goods they chose to specify. They even went so far as to order that certain goods should be imported only from certain countries and not from others. If the powers which the government then claimed had been upheld the overseas trade of Great Britain would have been at the absolute mercy of officials of the Board of Trade.

A test case was brought into court in December 1919, and the Attorney General and Solicitor General were briefed for the government at the taxpayer's expense. The former in upholding the claims of the Board of Trade did not even shrink from asserting that according to his construction of the Acts of 1853 and 1876 the Crown had power absolutely to prohibit the importation of corn, meat, or any other articles, and also had power to specify from what countries importation of these or other necessaries of life might be permitted. Fortunately the judge, Mr. Justice Sankey, took the commonsense view that the clause which gave a specific power to the Crown to prohibit the importation of arms and ammunition and gunpowder was not intended to give a general power of prohibition of all imports, but only a specific power to prohibit other imports of the same nature—*ejusdem generis*—as those named. Against this judgment the government had the wisdom not to appeal.

Meanwhile in anticipation of the judgment a Bill had been introduced into Parliament in November 1919—the Imports and Exports Regulation Bill—with the object of giving to the Board of Trade that complete control over our external commerce which the officials and politicians had been exercising by methods which they foresaw were likely to be declared illegal. This Bill proposed to give power to the Board of Trade to prohibit the importation of any goods whenever the Board was satisfied that such goods were being sold or were likely to be sold in the United Kingdom at a lower price than in the country of origin. It also proposed to give the same body of officials power to levy import duties on a scale to be fixed by themselves on any such goods as they graciously permitted to be imported. The Board of Trade was further to be empowered to prohibit the importation of any goods whatsoever coming from a country where the currency was depreciated relatively to the pound sterling. Further the Bill contained a long list of products of various kinds, all of which the Board of Trade might of its own motion

exclude from the United Kingdom. The list included dye stuffs and materials for producing them, colours, drugs, perfumes, photographic chemicals, organic chemicals, chemical re-agents, optical glass, laboratory glass, laboratory porcelain, scientific and optical instruments, carbons for arc lamps, magnetos, hosiery latch needles, gauges, and gas mantles. If the Board of Trade after prohibiting the importation of any of the substances contained in the long schedule here summarised, came to the conclusion that British manufacturers were putting up prices unduly it might fix maximum prices, and for that purpose it was to be endowed with power to demand as regards such goods, or as regards ' any materials, machinery, or accessories used in the ' production thereof ' detailed particulars as to ' ownership ' ' management, control, costs, prices and profits.'

These proposals were too much for the patience of the country, even in 1919. The Bill found no friends outside official circles. Even the Tariff Reform League was perturbed, and its executive committee, in a manifesto appearing in the *Tariff Reformer* for January 1920, declared that ' it must be clearly ' understood that the Bill did not in any way carry out the ' principles for which the League stands.' The Bill remained in a state of suspended animation for several months during 1920 and was finally abandoned.

To this extent the plot to bring the whole external trade of Great Britain under the control of officials in Whitehall failed. But other forces besides those of the bureaucracy remained at work to re-establish protection. Of necessity during the war the relative importance of many of our industries underwent a considerable change. The needs of war are very different from the needs of peace, and it was necessary to concentrate effort on the production of those commodities that our fighting forces most required. Some of these commodities had in peace-time been but little produced in this country. For example, I personally remember many years before the war having a conversation with the head of an important English firm engaged in manufacturing telescopes and microscopes. He told me that he habitually bought his lenses abroad, largely from France. Why ? Solely, he said, because the foreign lense-grinder worked more cheaply than the English lense-grinder. The Englishman could do the work just as well, but it was not worth an Englishman's while

to accept foreign scales of pay for lense-grinding, because he could get better wages at other work. Therefore it was better to leave him to do other work and to import foreign lenses.

In peace time this was an entirely reasonable course to pursue. A country that exports largely must also import largely, and a wise nation will import the things it can buy more cheaply abroad and export the things which it can best produce at home. The import of the glass we obtained from abroad was necessarily balanced by the export of some goods of home production, *e.g.*, Lancashire cottons or Yorkshire woollens, either to the country that supplied the glass or to some other part of the world that was selling to that country. From the commercial point of view the arrangement was satisfactory to all parties concerned. But the war created an enormously increased demand for optical glass among other things, and most of our foreign sources of glass supply were no longer available. It was therefore necessary to re-direct national effort to produce more optical glass and less calico or broadcloth. This was done promptly and with remarkable success. For example, in July 1916 Mr. Kellaway, M.P., speaking on behalf of the Ministry of Munitions, said :—

> ' British scientists, after a few weeks' experiments undertaken at the request of the Government, discovered many of the formulæ used by the Germans in the production of optical and chemical glass. Within a year after the outbreak of war the output of optical glass (needed for gun sights, periscopes, &c.) at home was multiplied four and a-half times ; now it has increased by fourteen times, and by the end of the year the increase will be twenty-fold.' (*Times*, July 8, 1916.)

Earlier in the same year a prominent protectionist newspaper called attention to the remarkable progress made by the glass industry, especially in the matter of laboratory glass :—

> ' Consider what representative firms in the British glass industry have essayed to do ; more, what they have done. In fewer weeks than the Jena people can claim years they have discovered the methods of our enemy to the extent of being able to meet the urgent needs of British laboratories, so far as glass utensils are concerned.' (*Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, March 14, 1916.)

Here, as in scores of other cases, the capacity of British industrial firms to swing over quickly from peace production to war production was fully demonstrated. But the firms that had swung over, being human, began to feel at a very early date that

they would like to secure permanency for the profitable business upon which they had embarked. Indeed the real purpose of the very article just quoted was to press on behalf of the manufacturers concerned a claim for post-war protection. The article, after dilating at length upon the triumphs achieved by Sheffield manufacturers without any fiscal assistance such as German manufacturers had received, went on to urge that Sheffield must be protected against German competition after the war :—

> 'Manufacturers, who for the present credit and for the future interests of our country have struck out from the old paths in spite of the conservative spirit of which they had been accused, though far more often than they deserved, must be afforded the advantages of tariff entrenchments in the industrial campaign ahead.' (*Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, March 14, 1916.)

There we have the real key to the present demand for the protection of key industries. The mental attitude of the manufacturers who put forward this demand is identical with that of the numerous persons who found comfortable posts in government offices during the war. These 'limpets'—as they are sometimes called in the daily press—want to stick for ever to their posts, and they are endlessly scheming to provide excuses for the continuance of the departments in which they serve. That is the main reason why so many of the industries of the country have been handicapped by war-time controls continuing for more than two years after the war has ended. If the controls had ceased the department concerned would have had to disappear and the officials employed would have lost their jobs. What the cost to the nation has been it is impossible to estimate. The amount paid in salaries is no mean sum, but it is insignificant in comparison with the indirect cost imposed upon the nation by the interference of ignorant officials with the practical details of business.

The whole country is sick of this interference, and with almost unbroken unanimity the nation demands that these war-time bureaucrats shall be dismissed without further delay. Yet the case of the war-time bureaucrat differs in no essential from that of the war-time manufacturer. Both did during the war work which was required by the nation ; both in so doing incidentally obtained advantages for themselves ; both ask that those advantages should be continued to them ; both have an abundance

of arguments to demonstrate that the private benefit for which they ask will prove of priceless value to the nation.

So far as the war-manufacturers are concerned the favourite plea is that the goods which they produce are essential to the conduct of war, and that if those goods are not produced at home during peace we shall be powerless when war comes. In view of our past experience this plea is hard to justify. We never have produced in this country all the commodities essential to the conduct of war. For example, in the Napoleonic Wars our navy was absolutely dependent upon imported hemp ; yet we maintained the command of the seas and won the battle of Trafalgar. In the Great War of 1914 a considerable portion of the navy was dependent upon imported oil ; in the future possibly the whole of our navy will be oil-driven. Yet, however many Acts of Parliament may be passed we shall not be able to obtain from within the British Isles sufficient oil for the navy's needs. In comparison with oil all the other commodities about which the new protectionist clamour is raised are insignificant. Moreover, as the event proved, we were able within a very brief period to produce at home all that we required of these minor commodities.

Our achievements in the matter of glass, above described, are typical of the whole story of the rapid adaptation of our peace industries to war needs. Laboratory porcelain is another commodity which has been listed as a key industry requiring protection. Before the war, according to the *Times Trade Supplement*, the production of this class of porcelain was a German monopoly, because the German hard paste porcelain was peculiarly suited for chemical use. When the war broke out the German supply of this speciality ceased. But at once English potters set themselves to produce it, although the quality required differed widely from English china.

' By November 1914 samples were ready for testing purposes, and by January 1915 deliveries had been commenced. . . . With experience in manufacture the quality of the English ware improved rapidly and wonderfully until now it bears favourable comparison with the German in essential properties and is indeed far superior in precision and nicety of manufacture.' (*Times Trade Supplement*, Feb. 26, 1921.)

Take again magnetos. These were largely imported from Germany before the war, because the Germans had specialised

in their manufacture. Naturally there was a temporary inconvenience when this source of supply was cut off; but the inconvenience was only temporary. On this point it is worth while to quote from an article in the *Morning Post* written at the beginning of the year 1916 to advocate a protective tariff for electrical machinery :—

'So completely was the trade in magnetos in German hands that the articles were not actually produced in this country. They had to be made and made quickly. Quite half a dozen firms are making magnetos now, and it is a source of satisfaction to know that their efforts have been eminently successful. The British magnetos not only passed the Government tests applied to them, but are considered as good as the articles made in Stuttgart.' (*Morning Post*, Feb. 11, 1916.)

Why then, it may be asked, should a protective tariff have been advocated. The answer is given in the same article in the words of a gentleman representing the British Electrical and Allied Manufacturers' Association. He said :—

'A $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. tariff is necessary. When manufacturers lay down special plant they must have some protection after the war if their plant is not to be scrapped.'

In other words, protection was frankly asked for, not to protect the nation against war dangers, but to protect the manufacturers against peace risks.

Take again the item of gauges, which also appears in the schedule of articles enumerated in the Imports and Exports Regulation Bill of November 1919. Why was this item there inserted? There was no difficulty about producing gauges in England. In February 1919 a meeting of all the English gauge manufacturers was held at the Ministry of Munitions. Sir R. T. Glazebrook, who as head of the National Physical Laboratory had been responsible for testing most of the gauges supplied during the war, was in the chair. The meeting was addressed by a member of the Ministry who had been engaged in purchasing gauges from the time the Ministry came into being. He stated that he had bought gauges in America, Scandinavia, France and Switzerland, and that he had found that English gauges were considerably cheaper than any other, and with the exception of those from one foreign firm considerably better. Why then did the Board of Trade put down gauges in its list of imports to be

prohibited? Solely because the well-organized association of gauge manufacturers asked for this favour. For four years they had been working on government contracts on terms not unprofitable to themselves, and they wanted the lucrative business which had thus been built up during the war at the expense of the nation, for the benefit of the nation, to be continued after the war at the expense of gauge users for the benefit of gauge makers.

There is no reason to believe that the facts are essentially different in the case of the dye-making industry which has already secured the passing of an Act of Parliament for its special protection. Before the war we imported from Germany most of the dyes—at any rate most of the best and fastest dyes—used in our textile and other manufacturing industries. We could have made these dyes in Great Britain if we had cared to take the trouble to do so. It was an English chemist who made the first discoveries which led to the creation of the synthetic dye industry, and other English chemists could certainly have been found to follow up those discoveries. But the Germans happened to develop a special interest in this particular industry and we left it to them.

That was not necessarily a foolish thing to do. No one country can have every industry within its own borders, and the localisation of industries is in practice determined by human accidents as well as by geological and geographical conditions. The Germans developed the dye industry, not because they had any special advantages for doing so, but because they chose to devote to it an immense amount of scientific research for which enterprising manufacturers were willing to pay. As long as peace continued we profited from their labours, for we were able to obtain at a comparatively small cost beautiful dyes which were of immense value to our textile manufacturers. The marvellous success of the Lancashire cotton trade in all the markets of the world was appreciably helped by the work of German chemists in discovering how to produce a variety of attractive and non-fading colours.

It may be argued that in accepting this boon we ran the risk of having our great textile industries brought to a standstill if the supply of German dyes should be withheld. That we ran some risk is indisputable; but it would be interesting to discover

the business in which no risks have to be run. The risk of being unable to obtain fast dyes was not the only, or even approximately the largest, risk that our textile industries ran. They also ran, and had to run, the risk of not being able to obtain their primary raw materials. Government-aided chemical factories, producing unlimited quantities of the most perfect dyes, would have provided no consolation whatever to our textile manufacturers if they had been unable to import raw cotton and wool. We do produce some wool at home, but no cotton at all. Obviously a shortage of dyes or even their complete disappearance, would have been a lesser evil to our cotton industry than the failure of the raw cotton to arrive safely at our shores ; for as long as we got the raw cotton we could at least manufacture plain cloth ; while without the cotton the dyes would have been useless. The value of the dyes we imported in 1913 was roughly £3,000,000; the value of the cotton yarn and cloth we exported was £126,000,000 ; while the value of the exports of woollens was £36,000,000.

It is however argued that the dye-making industry is of national value because the same chemical plant that is used for the production of dyes from coal tar products can also be used for the production of high explosives or poison gas. The importance of this argument can easily be over-estimated. The experience of the war proved that our chemists were very quickly able to produce the most effective explosives, and as soon as we made up our minds to imitate the Germans in the use of poison gas we succeeded in beating them at their own game.

Unfortunately it was impossible while the Dyestuffs (Import Regulation) Bill was passing through Parliament for members to discuss on their actual merits the claims for preferential treatment put forward by the firms engaged in making dyes. During the war the government had committed itself heavily to the dye-making industry both in the matter of cash and in the matter of promises. Exactly what the promises were is not quite clear, and it is still more difficult to disentangle the intricacies of the financial arrangements between the government and certain firms. But as the executive government had, in some way or another, pledged the credit of the nation, Parliament could not avoid taking some action. The pity is that before taking action the House of Commons did not insist upon a searching enquiry into

the history of the relations of the government, and of its advisers, with the commercial firms that were claiming protection. Those relations may have been entirely prompted by a desire to meet a war emergency by what appeared at the time to be the best method. But when the nation is called upon to redeem pledges given by its executive government it has a right to ask exactly what those pledges were, and precisely why they were given and to whom.

Apart from the special case of dyes parliament is free, and the issues that arise can be considered on their merits. Broadly the situation is that a number of small industries are clamouring to be placed in a preferential position as regards all the other industries of the nation. How small most of these industries are few people realise. Take the dye-making industry itself. As above mentioned, the total value of the dyes we imported before the war was only £3,000,000. The optical glass industry is carried on by a mere handful of firms in small factories. Similar considerations apply to magnetos, to latch needles, and to most of the other items about which a protectionist outcry has been raised.

It is true, on the other hand, that the chemical industry taken on the whole is a very important industry, and the demands for favourable treatment for various chemical products are sometimes put forward in such vague manner as to suggest that the whole industry is asking for protection on the ground that its existence is in peril. Such a proposition if made would be palpably absurd. Our chemical industry taken as a whole is both extensive and prosperous ; it not only furnishes supplies to the home market, but also exports very largely. Indeed the value of our chemical exports of all kinds—including drugs, dyes and colours—very largely exceeds the value of our chemical imports. The figures are worth quoting :—

CHEMICALS, DRUGS, DYES AND COLOURS.

	1913	1920
	£	£
Imports of foreign goods, less re-exports	11,925,000	29,959,000
Exports of British goods . .	19,533,000	40,730,000

An industry which both before the war and since the war has proved its capacity to maintain so large an excess of exports, while at the same time furnishing very large supplies for home consumption cannot be generally in need of any kind of protection. If particular branches of that industry claim that they need protection, the public is entitled to ask what explanation they have to give for their confessed inefficiency. The public is also entitled to ask upon what grounds the politicians and officials who control the Board of Trade have selected certain branches of this flourishing chemical industry and decided to confer upon them State favours at the expense of the rest of the community. These questions arise with all the so-called key industries put forward in the Board of Trade list. Take for example latch needles—instruments required in the manufacture of hosiery. There is no reason in the nature of the case why Englishmen should not make latch needles as well as any other of the myriads of tools and instruments that they manufacture in competition with the world. But it so happens that English latch needles are inferior to German and to American products. To the hosiery manufacturers it is obviously of importance to obtain the best possible latch needles at the lowest possible price. Yet for some reason the Board of Trade has decided to throw its sheltering arms around this minute and confessedly inefficient industry, to the injury of the immensely more important industries that require good and cheap latch needles. When this is a sample of the policy which has been adopted by or thrust upon the Board of Trade, the public is justified in viewing with suspicion the enormous powers which the new protection proposes to confer upon that department. It will have power, as above explained, not only to interpret its own list of key industries but also to decide absolutely what goods come under the anti-dumping tariff. That is to say it will be able to control not merely the business of the firms engaged in producing these products but also the business of the firms whose industry is dependent on the use of these products. In other words the financial success of a large number of little industries and of a considerable number of large industries throughout Great Britain will depend on the decisions reached by a small group of government officials in Whitehall.

It is difficult to see how under such conditions systematic corruption is to be avoided. There are other forms of corruption besides the payment of cash down. The line between government service and commercial life is much less clearly defined than it used to be. Business men were brought into the civil service in large numbers during the war; some of them still remain there. Further, in recent years it has become more and more the practice for business firms to offer important posts at high salaries to men who have won distinction in the civil service, but are willing for a consideration to leave it. Thus a service which, if it is to be impartial, ought to stand entirely outside commercial life is now to a very large extent commercialised. A man, while he is acting in the capacity of a government official, ought not to be asked to make decisions seriously affecting the profits of a business with which he may be personally connected a few months later. It is unfair to the public servant to thrust such a temptation upon him; it is unfair to the other industries concerned that the decision should be left in the hands of an official who may be so tempted.

Apart from the possibilities of corruption under the proposed scheme there is the certainty of delay. If business is to be successfully conducted decisions must be rapidly taken. The head of a great firm may be called upon to decide within a few minutes whether he will take a contract running into many thousands of pounds. His rapid decision is possible because of his business experience and of his business instinct; it is made with full consciousness that it will directly affect the interests of his shareholders, his own reputation, and his own fortune. But under the proposed scheme, so far as many of our industries are concerned, it will be impossible for business contracts to be made until authority has been obtained from a government department which in the ordinary course of official routine, will regard the whole matter with the leisurely indifference of an unconcerned neutral. A full statement of the case will have to be set out in writing on stereotyped forms, which will travel from room to room of the department to be initialled and passed on; at any point the documents may be held up for further enquiries which may take days, weeks or months. Again it must be repeated that such a system would be immensely more injurious to the

commerce of our country than the old-fashioned form of protection with fixed statutory tariffs ; for unless the tariff were prohibitive the parties concerned would make their arrangements with the knowledge that a customs duty of a certain amount had to be added to the other costs of the transaction.

So far as the whole scheme of key industries is concerned, there is an even broader reason why the policy of picking out particular industries for government favours should be rejected. It is this : that these industries, by the very fact that they come to Parliament begging for favours, confess their inefficiency. The man who by his own energy and enterprise builds up a successful business in face of the world's competition does not ask for political favours. The industries which are now being told to seek for support in the corridors of the Board of Trade are only those which declare themselves to be so weak that they cannot stand alone. But does the nation really want to preserve industries that cannot stand alone ? The support which they receive from the State must be paid for by the industries which are supporting themselves. Thus the whole policy resolves itself into subsidising the inefficient at the expense of the efficient. And the end of that policy is national inefficiency.

More generally it must be noted that all devices for protecting home industries are confined to the case of those home industries which produce for the home market. But as soon as one begins to think quietly one sees that an industry which is engaged in producing for export is really more important to the nation than an industry producing for home consumption. Both are home industries in any intelligible sense of the phrase ; that is to say they are industries carried on in this country and giving employment to our own people. But the industries which are producing for export must by the nature of the case be on the average the more efficient, because they have to send their goods across the sea to compete in foreign countries, without any kind of favour and often against hostile tariffs ; whereas industries producing for home consumption are partially protected by the cost of carriage, and also by the vague popular sentiment in favour of home-made goods. Therefore from the point of view of national efficiency it is clearly more important to develop home

industries which produce for export rather than home industries which only produce for home consumption.

Not only do we add to the wealth of the nation by developing these more efficient industries, but we add to our industrial security. For if a considerable number of our industries are capable of producing goods which they can sell at a profit to distant countries in competition with the whole world, they will collectively find little difficulty in producing any goods required for home consumption, and physically capable of production in this country, if the foreign supply of such goods should for any reason cease. It was because we had built up before the war such a powerful export trade that our industries were able directly the war began to swing over and to produce with a minimum of delay practically every commodity that the country required.

There is a further reason of an even more important character why England in particular should encourage her export industries. It is this : that they are the origin of her imperial development and remain to a large extent the basis of her imperial power. So far as England is concerned, the phrase Trade follows the Flag is to a large extent an inversion of the facts. In the expansion of England it was trade that led the way, and the flag followed. English merchants and mariners risking their own fortunes carried English goods to remote parts of the world ; they there established trading stations for buying with the English goods they sold foreign goods to carry back to England ; and in time those trading stations grew into a great Empire. The protectionist, whether of the new brand or the old, would have blocked, if he had had the power, this imperial development. His whole industrial policy is based upon the desire to shut out, under one excuse or another, foreign imports. But if imports are shut out, exports are shut in. Consequently if the protectionist policy were fully successful, the inhabitants of Great Britain, instead of carrying on trade with the whole world, and making their country the centre of world-wide empire, would be laboriously struggling to earn a scanty living on a little island surrounded by a ring-fence. Whatever his political creed may be the protectionist, in his economic heart, is a little Englander.

Similar considerations apply to that aspect of the new

protection which is concerned with protecting certain of our home industries against the low prices of imports which result from the depreciation of foreign exchanges. Of course it is a disadvantage to an English or Scottish manufacturer producing for the home market that his previous home customers are now able to buy some German goods more cheaply than before the war because the mark has fallen more in relation to the sovereign than it has fallen in relation to those goods. The English or Scottish manufacturer promptly demands protection, and a complacent government believes—or pretends to believe—that in conceding that demand for private favours it is subserving public interests. But the gain to the favour-begging producer involves a loss not merely to the consumer who has to pay more for what he wants, but also to all other producers in the country. If, for example, a father of a family can buy German toys cheaper than English-made toys he has more money left to buy clothes or furniture. It is true that the English paterfamilias gains less than the English toy-maker loses ; the paterfamilias only gains the difference between the English price and the German price of the toys ; whereas the toy-maker loses the whole order. That is indisputable, but the balance of the English toy-maker's loss has gone to enrich some other English or Scottish manufacturer ; for the payment due to Germany for the German toys can only be finally made by the export of some British goods of equal value to some part of the world. Here again it is our efficient industries for export that benefit when our relatively inefficient industries for home consumption suffer.

Further, if we are to shut out German goods from Great Britain because they are cheapened by the depreciation of the German mark, to what country is Germany to export ? She cannot pay any indemnity at all unless she exports her goods and so acquires the wherewithal to buy sterling bills. If we close our own ports to her, she will have to seek a market in competition with British goods in other parts of the world ; and if she wins that market now we may lose it for all time. Thus, the policy of excluding German cheap goods from Great Britain of necessity imperils our overseas trade, while at the same time injuring the general body of British consumers, including a large number of British manufacturers who want German materials or German tools for use in their works.

It may also be asked whether the government in accepting the depreciation of foreign exchanges as an excuse for a protectionist policy has considered what will happen if America adopts the same attitude. The pound is depreciated with regard to the dollar in the same way as, though of course to a smaller extent than, the mark is depreciated with regard to the pound. Therefore on the principles of the new protection the American government ought at once to exclude all British goods unless the price is put to a figure which counterbalances the fall in the exchange. That would mean that our chance of selling goods in the United States would be very greatly reduced, and the rate of exchange, instead of gradually recovering, would go from bad to worse.

It is unnecessary to say much about the anti-dumping proposals embodied in the new protection. The outcry against dumping is an old tale, though the anti-dumpers seem still unable to agree on a definition of dumping. If dumping merely means selling below the cost of production it is a thing which every manufacturer frequently finds himself obliged to do in order to clear off stocks. If it means selling to a foreign market at a lower price than the same goods are sold in the home market, that again may easily happen in the ordinary way of business. If, for example, the demand for hardware in England were active at a time when the foreign demand was slack, the Birmingham manufacturers, if their output were sufficient, would wisely sell at a lower price abroad in order to stimulate the foreign demand. There is no general reason why governments should interfere with these ordinary operations of commerce. The attempt to establish an anti-dumping tariff—with either definition of dumping—would involve the creation of an expensive official organization for checking costs and prices in the country of origin. The experience of Canada shows the futility of such a proceeding, and indicates quite plainly that the real purpose of anti-dumping legislation is to provide an excuse for giving protection to those industries which are politically influential.

On the other hand, it may be admitted that there is ground for taking measures against foreign dumping in cases where there is reason to suspect that a foreign government is aiding its

manufacturers to sell cheap abroad with the deliberate purpose of securing political advantages for itself by means of commercial warfare. That Germany did pursue this policy before the Great War is generally agreed ; how far she succeeded is a matter of doubt. But it is quite clear that under present conditions Germany cannot pursue this policy, for she has not a sufficient margin of national income to be able to spend public money in subsidising her export industries. On the contrary, she will be compelled to tax all her industries heavily in order to obtain the means to pay whatever war indemnity may be exacted from her. Simultaneously her manufacturers for export must strive to get the very best prices they can for their goods in order to have the means to meet their tax burdens. The anti-dumping cry is, in fact, out of date.

The plain truth is that all these question-begging cries are merely excuses put forward by various groups of manufacturers who want to obtain favours for themselves at the expense of their fellow citizens. Every manufacturer who is hit by foreign competition at once assumes that the injury to him must be a loss to the nation. But often it is a gain to the nation that an industry producing somewhat inefficiently for the home market should be replaced by a more efficient industry producing for an overseas market. Unfortunately the other and more efficient industry—though it is equally a home industry—remains in the background ; whereas the complaining industry keeps itself in the limelight by advertising its woes in the press and in parliament. The public is therefore easily led to believe that the favour-begging industries are typical of the industrial life of the nation ; for those that seek no favours remain silent and are therefore ignored.

Only on rare occasions is any public attempt made to show the other side of the picture ; to show the activity, the extraordinary adaptability and the general prosperity of the more important British industries. Such an occasion arose in February last, when a fair was held in London to show the progress of British industries. A section of the press wisely took advantage of this opportunity to call attention to some of the industrial triumphs our country has achieved. In particular very full and interesting descriptions of the fair appeared in the *Times Trade*

Supplement for February 26, 1921. The following are a few extracts from the reports given of particular industries :—

The report on pottery was made by a correspondent from Hanley. He wrote :—

' In viewing the best of the wares exhibited one cannot fail to be impressed by the modern spirit shown, giving the feeling that we are really evolving a characteristically English school of pottery design. . . . Since the war British potters have developed oversea trade to an unprecedented extent, and both by factory equipment and suitability of types and designs to the requirements of individual markets are ready to meet all calls which may be made on the industry.'

The report on ' general hardware ' opens with an enumeration of the principal commodities included in that term. They are : ironmongery, safe-locks, keys and brassware ; also nails, screws, rivets, springs, nuts and bolts. To show the magnitude of this trade the report states that one distributing firm alone, dealing exclusively with hardware, employs 250 men. The report adds : ' In spite of increasing competition and accumulating difficulties, ' British hardware increases its hold in the world's markets.'

As an example of a smaller industry, the manufacture of fishing rods and tackle is worth mentioning. This industry has had its headquarters for over a century in the town of Redditch. The report states :—

' No other town in Europe, it is believed, has (relatively) such a large overseas trade as Redditch. Fish-hooks were first manufactured there about the year 1800 and since then the trade has shown a wonderful development. The principal firm, established in 1805, has over 1,000 workpeople employed solely upon the manufacture of fishing tackle. . . . During the last few years fish-hooks have been manufactured in Germany, but cannot compare with the British hooks, and German dealers are now keen to get supplies from this country.'

A similar tale is told with regard to paints, varnishes and colours. After describing the enterprise of the manufacturers in producing new qualities of paints for various purposes the report goes on :—

' It is a pleasure to record the fact that, on the whole, the paint, colour and varnish industry of this country not only holds its own, but has every prospect of largely increased activities.'

Even the optical glass industry, now clamouring for protection, takes on a different aspect when approached from the point of view of the photographer. The report on photographic apparatus is contributed to the *Times Trade Supplement* of Feb. 26, 1921, by the editor of the *Photographic Dealer*. He writes :—

'Photographic apparatus and materials of British manufacture are to be found in every market in the world, and to maintain this position work is constantly proceeding in the experimental shops and laboratories of British photographic, optical, and chemical works. . . . Full advantage is being taken by British optical works of the new glasses produced in English glass works. There is now no type of photographic lens for the photographer's use that cannot be supplied in quality as good as, if not superior to, any foreign-made instrument.'

These are sufficient illustrations in detail of the kind of success that British industries achieve when they are left to fight their own battles by themselves, unprotected by Parliament and unhampered by officialdom. That these successes are not exceptional is proved by the general prosperity attained by the nation during the seventy years of commercial freedom that preceded the Great War. The proof of that prosperity was provided by the Great War itself. The greater part of the financial burden of the war fell upon England. She not only bore all her own war costs but she had to furnish enormous advances to her Allies. All this she did, and yet at the end of the war she emerged in a stronger financial position than any one of the belligerent Powers, except the United States. The relative immunity of the United States from war burdens needs no explanation ; she had only eighteen months of war ; we had more than four years.

Nor since the war has anything occurred to throw doubt on the wisdom of the policy which we pursued with such wonderful success for seventy years. The best general test of the efficiency of our manufacturing industries is to be obtained by comparing our imports of manufactured goods with our exports of similar goods. If our exports of these classes of goods are well ahead of our imports we are justified in inferring that our manufacturing efficiency is being maintained. The following illustrative figures are extracted from the Board of Trade returns :—

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF ARTICLES WHOLLY OR MAINLY MANUFACTURED FOR YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1920

	Imports, less re-exports	Exports of British-made goods
	£	£
Chinaware and earthenware	844,000	7,938,000
Glass and glassware	8,301,000	3,214,000
Iron and steel, and manufactures thereof	28,198,000	128,943,000
Scientific Instruments and Appliances (except electrical,) including photographic films	2,343,000	3,145,000
Electrical goods and apparatus	1,667,000	11,604,000
Machinery and parts thereof	18,241,000	63,458,000
Cotton Yarn	464,000	47,825,000
Cotton manufactures (except apparel)	7,023,000	353,858,000
Woollen and Worsted Tops and Yarns	9,662,000	22,452,000
Woollen and Worsted Manufactures (except apparel)	5,358,000	112,518,000
Silk and Silk Manufactures	30,675,000	5,198,000
Linen Manufactures	668,000	22,148,000
Chemicals, Drugs, Dyes, Colours	29,959,000	40,730,000
Vehicles, including locomotives, ships and aircraft	26,668,000	60,166,000
Other manufactured articles	231,511,000	237,535,000
TOTAL	£401,582,000	£1,120,732,000

In face of this table, showing how enormously our exports of manufactured goods exceed our imports of similar goods, it ought to be impossible even for politicians to pretend that our manufacturing supremacy is in peril.

EDITOR.

No. 477 will be published in July, 1921

INDEX

TO

VOLUME 233

January, 1921———April, 1921

INDEX

Titles of Articles are printed in heavy type

Abbott, Mr. G. F., *The Truth About Greece*, 146 *et seq.*
Ablett, Mr. Noah, *quoted*, 81, 89.
Abraham, Karl, 49.
Adler, Dr. Alfred, 49.
Adult Education, 357–371.
Africa—the racial question, 274 *et seq.* 280.
Agriculture—The Changing Countryside, 316–328.
Aikin, Dr., 373.
Ainslie, Mr. Douglas, *Croce's Æsthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic*, 125, 130.
Allen, Mr. W. E. D., *The Turks in Europe*, *quoted*, 146–156.
Anarchism, 375.
Anti-dumping proposals, the Government's, 405.
Art—Extremes of Modern Painting, 298–315.
Asclepiades of Samos, 329–342.
Asia—the colour problem, 267-283.
Asia Minor—Greek policy in, 157 ; French policy in, 159.
Austria—political situation : The Austrian Derelict, 209–217 ; attitude of Succession States, 215 *et seq.*

Badische chemical factory, 71.
Bagenal, Philip H., Irish Unrest Reviewed, 178–195.
Balfour, Mr. A. J.—suppression of crime in Ireland, 193.
Bauer, Otto, 92.
Balkan wars—King Constantine's and Venizelos' policies discussed, 146, 156.
Baudeau, 379.
Battleships—design : effects of competitive building, 244 *et seq.*
Beatty, Admiral Lord—The Battle of Jutland, 35 *et seq.*
Bernstein, 84.
Birrell, Mr. Augustine, Irish Administration, 193.
Blachford, Lord, *quoted*, 221.
Boisguillebert, 89
Bolshevism, 92, 214
Boraston, Lt.-Col. J. H., *Sir Douglas Haig's Despatches*, 10 *et seq.*
Borden, Sir Robt., *quoted*, 227, 230, 233
Bosanquet, Dr. Bernard, *Croce's Æsthetic*, 125, 133
Boycott, Capt., 188
Braque, M., 310
Brend, Dr. William A., Psychotherapy and War Experience, 48–68
Brett, Murder of Sergeant, 187
Breuer, Joseph, 50
Brian Boru, 173
Bridge, Admiral Sir Cyprian A. G., The Naval Situation, 238–254
British Empire—The Organization of the Empire, 218–237
British Empire Delegation at Paris, 232
Brock, Sir A. Clutton, *quoted*, 313
Brunner, Sir John, 76
Burke, Edmund, *quoted*, 220
Burnett, Hitchcock, Major-Gen. B.—on man power, 21
Business establishments, small—statistics of increase in Germany and United States, 82
Butler, Dr. George, 118
Butler, Dr. Henry Montagu, The Head of the Hill, 116–124
Butler, Rev. Weedon, 117

Capitalism II., 80–99; III., 371–386; Marx's prediction of the extinction of small businesses falsified, 82; the concentration and centralization of capital, 89 *et seq.*; development of small capitalists with the limited liability companies, 90; the trade union movement, 92; State intervention in industry, 93; welfare work; combinations and the restriction of free competition, 94; social improvements due to private enterprise, 95; approximation to social equality, 95 *et seq.*; increased standard of living, 372; disabilities and the causes of revolt, 375; fallacy of trying to change human nature by compulsion, 376; the principle of free trade, 378; capitalists frequently spring from working classes, 382; the revolt to abolish the system, 383; workers demand for a voice in management, 385; capital receives but moderate reward, 386
Carducci, 136 *et seq.*
Carr, Prof. H. Wildon, *The Philosophy of Benedetto Croce*, 125, 128
Ceardrighe, 168
Cecil, Alicia M., The Changing Countryside, 316–328
Celts—Beginnings of Irish History, 164–177
Cézanne, Paul, 305
Chamberlain, Mr. Joseph, and Imperial organization, 224
Chancellor, Mr. E. Beresford, *The Eighteenth Century in London*, 100–115
Changing Countryside, The, 316–328
Chardin, 301
Chemical industry—claim to protection, 407
Chemistry—A Great German Chemist, 69–79; German and British chemists compared, 72 *et seq.*
Child, Josiah, 380
Children—mental development, 64; sex-education, 66
Churchill, Mr. Winston—and the Dardanelles campaign, 7
Clan na Gael, 189
Clare, Earl of, on Irish crimes (1800), *quoted*, 198
Clark, Sir James, 77
Clarke, Sir A., *quoted*, 272
Clemenceau, M.—Col. à Court Repington's account of history of the Allied War Council, 11; and Doullens conference, 27.
Clifford, Sir Hugh, *quoted*, 275
Colbeck, Archibald, The Future of Naval Construction, 255–266
Colbert, 380
Cole, Mr. G. D. H., *Social Theory*, 344
Coles, Capt. Cowper, 250
Collie, Sir John, 60
Collison-Morley, Mr. L., D'Annunzio's Lyric Poetry, 136–145
Colonial conferences, 223 *et seq.*
Colour Problem, The, 267–283
Combinations, Industrial, 93
Connolly, James, 194, *quoted*, 200
Constable, *quoted*, 301
Constantine, King of Greece, Greece, Constantine and Venizelos. 146–163
Co-operative movement, 94; and Education, 367
Co-operative Union, 367
Cox, Mr. Harold, Ireland the Enemy, 196–208; The New Protection, 387–408
Croce, Signor Benedetto, 127
Cruithin, 168
Cubist movement, 310
Curzon, Lord, 229
Custance, Admiral Sir R., *quoted*, 251

D'Annunzio, Gabriele, D'Annunzio's Lyric Poetry, 136–145
Dardanelles campaign, 1915–17, 7
Davitt, Michael, 188

Deakin, Mr W , 223
De Bunsen, Victoria, *Old and New in the Countryside*, 316
" Defenders," 183
Denis, M. Maurice, 313
De Valera, 194, 200
Devoy, John, 188
Dillon, Mr. John, 188
Dinneen, Rev. P. S., 164
Divisionist painters, 302
Dodd, Dr. 118
Dodds, Mr. A. E., *Education and Social Movements*, 357–370
Doherty, Dr., *quoted*, 228
Dominions, British overseas—The Organization of the Empire, 218–237
Doullens conference (March 26, 1918), 26
Douris, 333
Dragoumis, Ion, 153
Dreams—Freud's theories, 52
Druids in Ireland, 166
Du Bois, Dr. W. C. B., 277, 282..
Dumping, 404
Dupont, Eugène, 193
Dürer, Albrecht, 310
Dye-trade—claim to protection, 398

Education—psycho-analysis and, 64 ; in rural districts, 325 *et seq.* ; Adult Education, 357–370 ; vocational training, 361
Eliot, Mr. T S , 127
Emmet, Robert, 186
Empire, The Organization of the, 218–237
Employers, small—extinction predicted by Marx not in sight, 82
Epstein, Mr. Jacob, 313
Erfurt programme, 84
Ernle, Lord, Adult Education, 357–370
Escouflaire, M. R. G., *Ireland : The Enemy of the Allies*, 196 *et seq.*
Ethiopian Church Movement, 276
" Etienne," *quoted*, 41
Exchanges, proposals for countervailing abnormal, 388–404

Fauviste movement, 308
Fenian conspiracy, 186
Fergusson, Mr. J. D., 309
Ferriar, Dr., 373
Feudal system, the revolt against, 377
Fiana, the, 171
Finance—development of the small capitalists with the limited liability companies, 90
Finlay, Prof. J. J., *Introduction to Sociology*, 347
Firbolgs, 167
Fiscal policy—The New Protection, 387
Fischer, Emil, A Great German Chemist, 69–79
Flugel, J. C., 49
Foch, Gen.—and Doullens conference, 27
Forster, Dr. M. O., A Great German Chemist, 69–79
Forster, W. E., 223
Foxwill, Prof., 88
Free Trade, 378 *et seq.*, 391 *et seq.*
Freud, Sigmund—theories discussed, 48
Frothingham Capt. Thomas G., *quoted*, 30
Fry, Mr. Roger, *Vision and Design*, *quoted*, 305
Futurist movement, 311

Gallipoli campaign. *See* Dardanelles campaign, 7
Garden city movement, 109
Gargiulo, Alfredo, *Gabriele D' Annunzio*, 136, 140
Garvey, Mr.—World Convention in New York, 275
Gauges industry—claim to protection, 395
Gauguin, Paul, 307

Germany :—
Chemistry—Emil Fischer's career and influence, 69-79
Navy—competitive building against British navy, 244
Gilman, Mr. Harold, 312
Ginner, Mr. Charles, 312
Gladstone, Mr. W. E., Irish policy, 189, 193
Glasier, J. Bruce, *quoted*, 382
Glass, scientific—claim by manufacturers for protection, 393
Glazebrook, Sir R. T., *quoted*, 395
Goode, Sir William, 211
Gore, Mr. Spencer, 312
Gournay, de, 379
Graham, Edward, *The Harrow Life of Henry Montagu Butler, D.D.*, 116-124
Graham, Mr. Stephen, *Children of the Slaves*, 267, 276
Grant, Madison, *The Passing of a Great Race*, 268
Grattan's Parliament, 183.
Greece—political situation : effect of recent elections, Greece, Constantine and Venizelos, 146-163
Gwynn, Captn. Stephen, Beginnings of Irish History, 164-177

Haig, Lord (Sir Douglas Haig)—despatches on the Western campaign, 10 ; and unity of command, 26
Hall, Mr. H. Duncan, *The British Commonwealth of Nations*, 218-236 *passim*
Hamilton, Lord Ernest, *The Irish Rebellion of* 1641, and *The Soul of Ulster*, *quoted*, 178 *et seq*
Hannay, Mr. David, The Battle of Jutland, 29-47
Harrow School—The Head of the Hill, 116-124
Hedylus, 334
Hibben, Mr Paxton, *Constantine I. and the Greek People*, *quoted*, 146, 148
Hipper, Admiral, 36
Hodgskin, Thomas, 87
Hoffman, A. W. von., 77
Hogan, Mr. James, *Ireland in the European System*, 196, 201
Holmes, Mr. C. J., 312
Housing—capitalism and, 372
Hughes, Mr. W. S., *quoted*, 233
Hypnotism—treatment of shell-shock cases under, 54
Hysteria, treatment of, 48 *et seq*

Imperial Conferences, 224
Imperial federation, 218-237, *passim*
Imperial Federation League, 222
Imperial War Cabinet, 229
Imports and Exports (Regulations) Bill, 390
Impressionists, 303
Incomes, improvement of, 371
India—British policy in, 271 ; Labour in India, 284-297
Industrial training, 361
Ireland—Beginnings of Irish History, 164-177 ; Irish Unrest Reviewed, 178-195 ; Ireland the Enemy, 196-208
Rebellions—the great (1641), 179 ; (1798), 183
Irish Socialist Republican Party, 194

Jellicoe, Admiral Lord, and the Battle of Jutland, 29-47
John, Mr. Augustus, 312
Johnston, Sir H., *The Backward Peoples and Our Relations with Them*, 267 *et seq* 278.
Jones, Ernest, 49, 57
Jung, C. J., 49
Jutland, The Battle of, 29-47 ; 238-254

Kaiser-Wilhelm Institut für Chemie, 73
Kandinsky, Wassily, 311
Keating, Geoffrey, *The History of Ireland*, *quoted*, 164 *et seq*
Kellaway, Mr. F. G., *quoted*, 392
Kerr, Admiral Mark, *quoted*, 146 *et seq*
"Key industries," protection of, 387 *et seq*

Labour—nature of the antagonisms of labour and capital explained, 92 ; relations under modern capitalist system, 383 ; the demand for a voice in management of works, 385 Welfare work, 94
Labour College, 367
Labour in India, 284-297
Lalor, James Fintan, 186
Lao Tse, the Chinese philosopher, *quoted*, 1
Larkin, James, 194
Latch needle industry—claim to protection, 399
Law, Mr. A. Bonar, *quoted*, 234
Lawson, Mr. J. C., *Tales of Ægean Intrigue*, *quoted*, 146, 154
Lay, Wilfred, 49
Lecky, Mr.—*History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, 178 *et seq*
Legislation—fallacy of attempting to impose goodness by compulsion, 375
Letrosne, 379
Lewis, Sir George Cornewell, *The Government of the Dependencies*, 221
Lewis, Mr. Wyndham, 313
Liberty, individual—results of excessive restriction discussed, 377
Liebig, 77
Literary Criticism, The Function of 125-135
Lloyd George, Mr. David—conduct of the War, 11 *et seq.*, 22 ; speech on M. Venizelos' policy in Asia Minor (July 21, 1920), 157 ; on the Imperial War Cabinet, 230
London. The Growth of, 100-115 ; expansion with its development as a financial and commercial centre, 102 *et seq* ; suburban development, 106 ; effect of the war, 108 ; the garden city movement, 109 ; change in local government anticipated, 111 ; absence of local pride, 111 ; literary associations, 114 ; the scenic appeal of London, 114-115
Lowry the Mariner, 169
Lucas, Sir C. P., *Greater Rome and Greater Britain*, *quoted*, 226
Lugard, Sir F. D., The Colour Problem, 267-283
Lynd, Mr. Robert, *The Art of Letters*, 125

MacArt, Cormac, 170
McCurdy, Dr., 53, 57
MacDougall, Prof W., *The Group Mind*, 352
MacIver, Mr. R. M., *Community : A Sociological Study*, 354
MacNeill, Prof. Eoin, *Phases of Irish History*, 164 *et seq*
Magneto industry—claim to protection, 395
Manchester—housing and sanitation (1795), 373
" Manchester Martyrs, The," 187
Mandeville, *quoted*, 374
Mansbridge, Mr., 368
Manual training, 361
Marquet, M., 309
Marriott, Mr. J. A. R., The Organization of the Empire, 218-237
Marx, Karl—theories analysed, 80, 384
Matisse, M. Henri, 308
Mavrogordato, Mr. John, Greece, Constantine and Venizelos, 146-163
Messel, 76
Metzinger, M., 310
Milesians, 167
Mills, Mr. Arthur, *Colonial Constitutions*, 221
Milner, Lord—and Doullens conference, 26
Mitchel, John, 186
Molly Maguires, 188
Mond, 76
Monet, Claude, 301
Moton, Dr., *quoted*, 277, 278, 282
Murphy, Father John, 184
Murry, Mr. J. Middleton, *Aspects of Literature*, 126
Mustapha Kemal, 160

Nash, Mr. John, 315
Naumann, Dr. Friedrich, *quoted*, 227
Navy :—
Armaments v. Armour, 253
Beneficent use, 238 *et seq*
Future of Naval Construction, The, 255-266
Grand Fleet—and the battle of Jutland, 32 *et seq*
Naval Situation, The, 238-254, *passim* ; 255-266 *passim*; 238-254
Shipbuilding policy, 238-254 ; 255-266; competitive building with Germany recalled, 244 ; possible competition with the United States, 246 ; effect of submarines, 255
Nemedians, 167
Nemours, Dupont de, 379
Neo-Impressionists, 302
Nervous system, disorders of—Freud's theories, 49-68
Neurasthenia, treatment of, 54
Nevinson, Mr., 313
Niall of the Nine Hostages, 172
Nitric acid—production from atmospheric nitrogen in Germany during the War, 73
Northcott, Clarence H., **A Science of Society**, 343-356
Northumberland, Earl of—battle orders of 1636, *quoted*, 37

O'Brien, Mr. Smith, 186
O'Connell, Daniel, 185
O'Mahony, John, 187
O'Neil, Sir Phelin, atrocities in Ireland, 179

Painting, Extremes of Modern, 298-315
Pan-African Conference (Paris), 275
Papini, Giovanni, 136
Parental responsibility, 64
Parkes, Sir H., *quoted*, 273
Parnell, Mr. J. S., 188
Parthalonians, 167
Peel, Sir Robt., *quoted*, 197
" Peep of Day Boys," 183
Perkin, Dr., 76
Pétain, Gen.—and Doullens conference, 26
Phœnix Park murders, 189
" Physiocrats, the," 380
Picasso, Pablo, 310
Pirenne, Prof., 377, 381
Pissarro, Camille, 299 *et seq.*
Pissarro, Mr. Lucien, 312
Plebs League, 367
Poor Man's Guardian, *quoted*, 382
Porcelain industry—claim to protection, 395
Posidippus, 334
Post Impressionism, 298
Pre-Raphaelites, The, 299 *et seq.*
Private enterprise—social improvements effected by, 95 ; undesirability of excessive restrictions, 378
Problems of the First World War, 1–28
Production for profit, 80 *et seq.*
Protection, The New, 387–408
Proud, Miss, *quoted*, 94
Psycho-analysis, 48–68
Psycho-Neurological Society, 61
Psychotherapy and War Experience, 48–68

Quesnay, 379

Redmond, Mr. John, *quoted*, 195
Renner, Dr., 90
Repington, Col. C. à Court, *The First World War*, 1914–1918, 3 *et seq.*
Revisionism, 84
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, *quoted*, 298, 301
Ricardo criticised, 385
Ribbon Society, 185
Rice, Miss Anne Estelle, 309
Ricklin, Franz, 49
Rivière, Mercier, de la, 379
Robertson, Field Marshal Sir William, on the German offensive of 1918, 8

Rockhill, Mr., on population of China, 269
Ross, Prof. E. A., *Principles of Sociology*, 346
Rowell, Mr., *quoted*, 235
Royal College of Chemistry, 77
Rural life—The Changing Countryside, 316–328
Ruskin College, 367
Russia :—
Bolshevism—strikes against state factory directors, 92
Rutter, Frank, Extremes of Modern Painting, 298–315

St. Germain, Treaty of, 210 *et seq*.
St. Godric, 377
St. Patrick, 173
Samos, Asclepiades of, 329–342
Scheer, Admiral von, *Germany's High Sea Fleet in the War*, 29–47
Sea power, British—beneficent use, 238 *et seq.*; the submarine question discussed, 255 *et seq.*
Serra, Renato, 138
Service, Sir James, 223
Seurat, 302
Severini, Gino, 311
Sèvres, Treaty of—Greece and, 158
Sexuality—Freudian theories discussed, 51; sex education, 66
Shadwell Dr. A., Capitalism II., 80–99; III., 371–386
Shell shock, 52
Sheridan, Mrs., *quoted*, 95, 97
Sichel, Mr. Walter, The Head of the Hill, 116–124
Sickert, Mr. Walter, 312
Signac, M. Paul, *quoted*, 302
Sinn Fein movement, 194
Sismondi, *Nouveaux Principes d'Économic Politique*, *quoted*, 86; *Revue mensuelle d'Économie Politique*, *quoted*, 87
Sleeping partners, 90
Slums, capitalism and, 372
Smith, Adam, 379–380
Smuts, Gen. J. C., *quoted*, 233 *et seq.*
Smyrna—French policy, 160
Socialism—Karl Marx's theories as to capitalism analysed and refuted, 80–99 *passim*; fallacy as to changing human nature by legislation, 375
Society, A Science of, 343–356
Sociology—A Science of Society, 343–356
Spencer, Herbert, *quoted*, 372
Squire, Mr. J. C., *Life and Letters*, 125–6
Stamp, Sir Josiah, *quoted*, 371
Starr, Mr. Mark, *quoted*, 81
State intervention in industry, 93
Stephens, James, 187
Stoddard, Mr. Lothrop, *The Rising Tide of Colour*, 267–283
Streit, Mr., 147
Submarines—effect on naval policy, 255
Surplus value, 81
Sydenham, Lord, *quoted*, 249, 271
Syndicalism, 375

Tara, Conquest of, 170
Thomas, Rear-Admiral H. Evan, 36 *et seq.*
Thompson, William, 87
Thomson, Brigadier-Gen. C. B., *Old Europe's Suicide*, *quoted*, 6 *et seq.*
Tilby, Mr. A. Wyatt, The Growth of London, 100–115
Tone, Wolfe, 186
Toynbee Hall, 368
Trade—effects of excessive regulation discussed, 378; The New Protection, 387
Trade Unions—and the capitalist system, 92
Trevelyan, Sir George, 116, 121
Trusts, 94
Tuatha de Danann, 167
Turgot, 379

Ulster—plantation of, 180
United States—naval policy, 242, 246 ; the colour problem, 276
Urwick, Prof. E. J., *The Philosophy of Social Progress*, 347
Ussher, 167

Van Dongen, Kees, 309
Van Gogh, Vincent, 306
Vaughan, Dr., 120
Venizelos, M., Greece, Constantine and Venizelos, 146–163
Vienna—conditions in, 211
Village Clubs Association, 326
Vocational training, 362
Vorticist movement, 314

Wadsworth, Mr. Edward, 314
War, the (1914–1919) :—
Allied Command, unity of, 23
Allied War Council, origin of, 11, 17
British overseas Dominions and, 226
Eastern and Western Campaigns, rival claims of, 5 *et seq.*
Germany—work of Chemists, 69–79 *passim*
Imperial War Cabinet, British, 229
Italian campaign—Col. Repington and, 15
Jutland, The Battle of, 29–47
Man-power question, 19
Naval campaign—effect of submarine warfare, 255 *et seq.*
Problems of the First World War, 1–28
Psychotherapy and War Experience, 48–68
Repington, Col à Court, *The First World War, quoted*, 3 *et seq.*
Western campaign—Sir Douglas Haig's despatches, 10 *et seq.*
Webb, Sir Lisle, 60
Weir-Mitchell, Dr., 54
Wells, Mr. H. G., *Outline of History, quoted*, 146
Wexford insurrection (1798), 184
Whistler, J., 300
White, William A., 49
Whiteboys, the, 181
Williams, Mr. Orlo, The Function of Literary Criticism, 125–135
Wilson, Field Marshal Sir Henry, 21, 27
Workers' Educational Settlement, 367
Wright, Mr. F. A., Asclepiades of Samos, 329–342

"Yellow Peril, The," 270
Young, H. A., Labour in India, 284–297
Young Ireland Party, 186
Young Men's Christian Association, 368
Young Women's Christian Association, 368

Printed in Great Britain by ROFFEY & CLARK, *Croydon.*

Author Edinburgh Review.
167277
P
LE
E
Title Vol. 233, Jan.-Apr. 1921.
DATE.
NAME OF BORROWER.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU